

attended to by one National Secretary and one or two assistants, we have now a national office composed of various departments employing scores of people and doing a work which requires the greatest possible efficiency in every way.

We have sought to attain two main objects in drafting this new Constitution which we are now about to submit to you. One was to maintain all features of true democracy in the Socialist organization. The other was to increase the efficiency of the organization. While under the old Constitution we had plenty of democracy, we had, on the whole, very little efficiency. Now there is no conflict between the two. Democracy should not exclude efficiency. On the contrary, democracy properly understood spells efficiency, and we believe we have prepared a large scheme of organization in which both principles unite very well.

The features of our old Constitution which we thought stood most sorely in need of amendment were those relating to the administration of the national organization. What we now have is a National Committee, a National Executive Committee, a National Secretary, convention and referendum. Each one of these five factors in our administration is practically independent of the others, to such an extent, at least, as to interfere very often with each other.

For instance, the National Committee has practically the same powers and the same functions as the National Executive Committee. The difference between the two is that one holds no meetings, and transacts business by correspondence. The other does hold meetings. And very often we have a spectacle of this kind: Of two entirely opposite motions originating in each of the two bodies, sometimes taking effect together, and one nullifying the other; or a case of this kind, where, for instance, a large sum of money is appropriated by the National Committee without consulting or taking into account the appropriations made by the National Executive Committee. The result has been a certain uncertainty. With this we have no sense of responsibility in our national office. The National Executive Committee in its action is subject to the National Committee, but not fully so, not completely so. It is a body elected by the membership of the party, independent of the National Committee, and hence there is a certain rivalry between the two which is not healthy for our work and for the welfare of the party.

The National Secretary, again, is likewise elected by a general vote. He does not owe his existence to either the National Executive Committee or the National Committee. He is an independent organ of administration, with duties prescribed by the Constitution, and elected directly by the membership.

And there is another conflict, a certain conflict between the National Secretary and the National Committee or the National Executive Committee. There is also a certain laxity in the relations between the Secretary, the National Committee and the National Executive Committee. He is subordinate to the other two bodies; and the question arises very often, to which one primarily? and nothing is determined about that.

We have complicated the situation by the election of an independent National Woman's Committee, likewise elected by general vote, with a Secretary or General Correspondent of this committee. Also that is in a somewhat indefinite status.

Now, this feature, the lack of a center of responsibility for the administration of the party affairs, has not worked well of late, and will certainly work still less so in the future as our party grows bigger and as its task becomes more important.

Furthermore, in the election of these officials and committees, we have not adopted the best method of getting the most efficient comrades to serve. As to the National Committee, we are not concerned with it. The states take care of that. As to the National Executive Committee, the paradox has been this: That while the committee is strictly a business committee to attend to routine work, technical matter of organization and propaganda of the party, holding a position which requires certain well-defined special qualifications, our election by general vote has necessarily degenerated into a sort of a general popularity contest. It could not be otherwise; because when we submit a string of names to 150,000 persons, 100,000 of whom have come into the organization, say within the last two years or thereabout, and when we submit men taken from any part of the country to all the voters of the entire country, we cannot expect anything else than that the best known names should be elected. Now, comrades, as a member of the National Executive Committee, elected under the present mode, I will not be charged with special bias or personal bias against the mode of election. But let us take the last election as a concrete illustration, and what do we find? We have a National Committee composed of comrades who reside, two of them, on the Pacific Coast, two on the Atlantic, and the rest somewhere in the middle western states. We have elected them in alphabetical order. They were submitted to us in alphabetical order, and they were elected in the order of the vote alphabetically. It may be a coincidence; it may be an accident, but it is still significant that with a single exception, commencing with B—we had no A—the vote was alphabetical: Berger being first; Harriman next; Haywood third; Hillquit fourth; Irvine fifth; O'Hare sixth; Spargo seventh. You can analyze each and every one of them, and you will find that each and every one of them was elected for a reason entirely unrelated to his or her qualifications to be a member of the Executive Committee; one because he did a very clever stunt in getting himself elected to Congress, and a very clever stunt or series of stunts in Congress. (Laughter.) He did well. But, let me tell you right now that Victor L. Berger may happen to be an excellent man for the National Executive Committee; I will testify here as his colleague on the board that he is. But Victor L. Berger, holding the position that he does, and having done the work he had in Congress, might not be possessed of a single qualification for member of the National Executive Committee, and yet he would have been elected, anyway.

But I am not going to take up all the individuals; but some have been punished by their friends or enemies for having written books, and we send them to the National Executive Committee; others for editing newspapers; others for other purposes, but not one because the party membership actually know or thought that he or she possessed special qualifications for this particular office. The result is, let me tell you right now, that, facing a national campaign we will be compelled to elect—that is my personal opinion—a National Campaign Committee who can be on the job all the time. The National Executive Committee as elected cannot supervise and handle and

manage a national campaign, one of its most important duties.

Now, similarly, the National Secretary Comrade Work, may be an excellent man for the position, but I make bold to state that he was elected because he temporarily held that position at the time of the election. And every National Secretary, whether good, bad or indifferent, fit or unfit, is sure of re-election under the present method of procedure so long as he is willing to stand. Now, in some cases it may be an excellent thing; he may be the best man. In other cases he may be the very worst fitted man for the position, and still will be re-elected. It is natural. How can you expect 150,000 or 300,000 people from all over the country to know the qualifications of any one individual in the party for that particular office? Make no mistake; the question of the National Secretary, his ability and his fitness for the office, is more important than that of the National Executive Committee or National Committee, for he is on the job every day and determines the practical work and politics of the party every day in the year.

Now, then, comrades, we say that this is not democracy, it is a caricature of democracy. Democracy does not consist in wanting to have everybody do everything simultaneously. (Applause.) It consists in a proper, intelligent arrangement by which the best fitted persons are elected to do certain tasks, subject to the approval of the constituency, and with the power of the constituency to recall them at any time if they do not suit or make good.

Now, your Constitution Committee suggests a general scheme which, in its opinion, will do away with all the objects mentioned. We start out by saying, let us first of all create a body primarily responsible for the administration of the party affairs. Let every other administrative organ derive its powers from that body, be responsible to that body, be controlled by that body, so that there shall be no conflict between them. Let us devise a method by which in the selection of our Executive Committee and officers we will have some intelligent discussion, a meeting face to face of the men chargeable with the duty of making the proper selection, an opportunity to go over the qualifications of the candidates, an opportunity to intelligently consider the entire situation, and then make the selection after such consideration.

We suggest that the responsible body, the body of primary power and responsibility, be the National Committee of the Socialist Party, elected by the states as heretofore.

We suggest that the Executive Committee, as its name indicates, be an executive committee of that National Committee, and not an independent one selected by the members. (Applause.)

We suggest that the National Secretary be the Executive Secretary of the National Committee, and not an independent official.

And we suggest, further, that the National Committee become a real, working, functioning body. It is not such a body now. It has practically a mere nominal existence until it comes to some mischief or other, as the voting of \$1,000 for the victims of mine disasters, which could be used for much more legitimate purposes and functions. Now, we propose to have the National Committee meet regularly in actual session at least once a year, and in such meeting take up and discuss the organization problems and working problems before the party and dispose of them in an intelligent way. In other words, have a convention in miniature on the basis of representation which we

propose. That would mean about 75 members at present, probably 100 in a year or two, coming together once a year, receiving all reports, investigating into the condition of the national office, making elections of an Executive Committee, and an Executive Secretary, a Woman's National Committee, and a General Correspondent for that Woman's Committee, all after due and proper deliberation.

We have in view also that this will dispense with the biennial congresses, and will at the same time give us a chance to have annual conventions in miniature. (Applause.) Now, comrades, that is one of the most important points. There is not a Socialist Party in the world which does not meet annually in convention for the transaction of business, and if there is any party that needs such meetings most urgently, it is the Socialist Party of the United States, at present in the period of its most rapid growth, for every year presents new problems, new situations, which should be dealt with intelligently and in session and by debate, discussions and deliberations.

Now, we also propose that this National Committee be composed primarily of the state secretaries of the various states, who will act as members-at-large for the state, if you want, and additional members, according to the membership of the respective states. What we expect to achieve by it is the following. When we have our National Committee elected, or even our Congresses, we send the most popular men today to them, but the actual workers of the party, those who will have in their hands the execution of our decision, they very often stay away; they are not elected. Now, the National Committee, or the national organization for that matter, is nothing but a sort of bureau or general agency for the transaction of the business of the Socialist Party in the different state organizations. We have no existence outside of the state organizations. The state organizations compose the physical party. The state organizations do the work of the party. And as we grow that will become more and more the case, and for this reason it is important that the men elected by the state to transact the business of the Socialist Party within the state, first, shall have a voice in the formulation of the general policies of the Socialist Party; and second, shall be in as close a touch with the general work as we can make it possible; for a state secretary, taking part in the national convention and returning to his state, will be best qualified to carry out the general spirit and policy of the party as determined in that meeting of which he constitutes a part.

Now, further, we provide also for a change in the method of conducting the referendum vote. We do not curtail it. We leave it to the extent of requiring the same low percentage, five per cent, of the membership, to initiate a referendum at any time. But we make this change, comrades: Instead of allowing any local to initiate a referendum, we require the state, through the membership of the State Committee or the State Executive Committee, if authorized to do so, to initiate a referendum; and if seconded by similar state organizations representing a total of five per cent of the membership or by any five state organizations, then the referendum will be called.

The reason for doing that is as follows: First, the present method of dealing with locals, where our entire scheme of organization is based upon state division very largely. Second, when we have reached a point of having five thousand locals, as we

do, some of them composed of several thousand members, and others of half a dozen members, it is unwise, it is improper to allow such one of these locals to initiate referendum. Whether they will be subsequently supported or not is another question. But in the meanwhile, Local Honolulu may submit for a referendum a motion that we forthwith proceed to socialize all the instruments of wealth and distribution, and other locals may submit similar referendums. The result is that our National Bulletin is clogged every week with dozens of such referendums, carried on from week to week without sense, right or reason. Now, we say that the local which cannot get the support of its own state for any proposition which it originates has no right to come before the national organization and demand its adoption. (Applause.)

Comrades, this is a general outline. We have made other changes, many more which will come up as the Constitution or the draft of it is read, to you point by point. What we had in view by the entire scheme was to create a democratic, but nevertheless strong, political organization, which will be in a position and which will be able to take advantage of the great opportunities which unfold themselves before us in our work and propaganda day after day, and which we have been compelled to sorely neglect in the past. (Applause.) If there is no objection, our committee would like to have our very able reading clerk, Comrade Strickland, read the Constitution to the convention.

DEL. ALEXANDER (Tex.): I move to take up the Constitution seriatim. (Seconded.)

DEL. CALDWELL (Pa.): I move that the Constitution be read as a whole, and then be taken up seriatim. (Seconded.)

DEL. WILLIAMS (Pa.): I make an amendment that we take it up seriatim and read it. (Seconded.)

The amendment was carried. Article I of the Constitution was read, and there being no objection was declared adopted.

Article II was read.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection?

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I move to insert after the words "all other political parties" the two words "or organizations." (Seconded.) Under the commission form of government we will not have political parties in the cities where such methods are introduced. It will be political organizations, and therefore we must provide whether a member has a right to vote with non-partisan so-called political organizations. Besides that, there are many political organizations.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee accepts. Is there any objection now as it stands? The words are now in the report.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): A point of information. Will that read "all other political parties and organizations" or "all other political parties and political organizations?"

THE CHAIRMAN: You will have to ask the committee.

DEL. HILLQUIT: What is meant, surely, is political organizations.

DEL. MERRICK: Some comrades raised the question of ambiguity on that, and I believe the committee should accept it.

DEL. HILLQUIT: They will accept "political organizations" to make it perfect.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee's report is "political organizations."

DEL. PATTERSON (Ohio): In the next to the last line, after the various qualifications enumerated, are the words "shall be

eligible to membership in the Socialist Party." I hold that whether he shall be or shall not be should be left to the local; that there should not be a construction placed upon that to the effect that if he comes up to the several political requirements in this section that he is eligible and shall be eligible. There are quite a few people that, in my opinion, are not eligible even after they have fulfilled this requirement. I want that changed to "may be eligible." Whether he shall be eligible, or the question of his eligibility, should be left to the local.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you make a motion? That is not before us unless there is a motion.

DEL. VIERLING (Mo.): I move that the last clause be changed to read as follows: "May be admitted to membership in the party." (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready to vote on the amendment as made by Del. Vierling of Missouri?

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): I oppose changing a word. I think all that the delegate wants in the amendment is to cover it as it now reads. I don't want to put anything in there that would give anyone a chance to point out in the Constitution and say, "This is what I am actually for." I think we already have enough without specifying a lot of other requirements. When it comes to dealing with people that are objectionable in any branch or in any local, we have the power to defeat them by our vote, and I do not think we would strengthen that by putting this in. I believe if we give people a chance to start a trial for heresy we would probably keep eligible people out of the party.

DEL. CLIFFORD (Ohio): It is very important that we safeguard our organization at this stage of its career. We have persons in the city of Cleveland that under no circumstances would we admit to our party organization. We know positively, beyond a doubt, that if they sought admission into the party organization, they would have ulterior motives. There are some people in this world who are beyond redemption. (Laughter.) I stand for that amendment so that the admission of these people shall be at the discretion of the local, the members of the party who are on the firing line right there in that locality and who know all about the raw material.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I am in favor of this provision, too. That is exactly the way they are working at present. There is no reason to fear that somebody may get into the Socialist Party that is not wanted. It is a fact that we have the power to pass on the admission of members in the local organization. Up to this time we have always been able to keep out undesirable elements from the party, and if you accept this you thereby make it so that they may be eligible. The point raised by Comrade Moore of Pennsylvania is correct. It leaves it possible for the local organization to keep undesirable elements out of the party. I therefore vote in favor of the report of the committee.

DEL. TAYLOR (Ill.): A point of information. Is it not true that the part of this article that is printed in plain type is the old Constitution as it stands, and that the black-faced type is new material?

DEL. HILLQUIT: The statement should have been made by the chairman of the committee before, but you will bear in mind that all which is in light type represents sections taken over bodily from our old

Constitution, while the heavy type contains the sections amended or new sections.

DEL. VIERLING (Mo.): I would like to state that the word "shall" makes it obligatory upon the local to admit the member who may come within the scope of the preceding words. The Constitution of the Missouri Socialist Party says that they may be admitted if they conform to those words. If you say they shall be eligible, it is an invitation to the applicant, and I believe that the local on the ground, that is, the local to which the application is made, should be the authority to say who shall be admitted to membership. You here in national convention assembled may state in general terms what the qualifications shall be, but after all it is the people to whom the application is made who should say whether or not he shall be admitted. I trust that you will vote for the amendment, because it leaves this power with the local where the application is made, and you are only then exercising the right which the comrade has spoken about.

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): It seems to me that the delegates who are afraid that undesirable people will come in are unduly alarmed. What this Constitution really means is that no local shall make any other clause as a requisite for membership. We vote on applications for membership individually. We can appoint, if we want, committees to investigate the candidate. We can, if we want, vote against admitting people to membership, and we do not have to give a reason. What this means is that no state or no local can draw the color line or can draw the religious line, or draw any other line except as provided here, and for that reason I favor the report of the committee.

The previous question was moved.

DEL. PRIESTAP (Ohio): I am for the amendment. I am from Lima, Ohio, and I want to explain to you the difference between "may" and "shall." We had quite a trouble in our local, which you all know, and the difference came right here. We had a lawyer who was nominated for the Board of Safety, and you all know that we dumped the whole bunch because they were not obeying the mandates of the Socialist Party. The trial turned on just exactly such words. They pay close attention to them, and when it says "shall," he sticks right to it. I admit that not all the members of the Socialist Party in our locals have just exactly the same kind of milk in their cocoanuts, and when one of these fellows who are able to make trouble gets started he will make a great deal out of the difference between "shall" and "may." This word "may" should remain in that article.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will have to give the floor to the committee, following the precedent. The committee has a right to speak five minutes in favor of the matter as it stands without amendment.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): It seems to me absolutely unnecessary to debate this question. In the first place, I am not a master of authority on English, but I think many of the comrades are mistaking the word "eligible" for the word "elective." I want to call your attention to this fact: We have had this clause precisely as it stands for many years. (Applause.) We have almost 6,000 locals, and in all those years not even one of those 6,000 locals has asked for a change in this word. That is the best proof that it has worked all right throughout the United States. Let it stand.

The amendment to substitute "may" for "shall" was put and lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now going to vote on Section I as reported.

DEL. BESSEMER (Ohio): I am very much at sea if we are going to vote on the whole section. I was under the impression that we are voting on this amendment. I have a very important amendment to add in there. I was simply waiting patiently till this other amendment was disposed of. I have a very important matter to offer.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair stands corrected. We will listen to the amendment.

DEL. BESSEMER: I wish to add in the third line, after the word "creed" the words "or affiliation with any other labor organization or movement." (Seconded.)

The previous question was moved.

DEL. BESSEMER: I have a right to speak on my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has ruled that the amendment was permitted, but not to be discussed.

Del. Bessemer appealed from the decision of the Chair, and the appeal was sustained.

DEL. BESSEMER: My reason for making that amendment is that I know of one specific case at least where a member had been a member of the Socialist Party for three years, with his card with the due stamps on it, and he had been away from the city or out of the local for a year or two, and in that time had been very active or had advocated industrial organization. He came back to that town and appealed to the party to re-admit him. In the meantime there had been considerable discussion in the local over the tactics of labor organizations, and it seemed that those who were opposed to industrial organization, for no other reason than they admittedly said they would not allow a man in their organization or in that local that would work or speak for industrial organization, and they voted against admitting that man to the party. We know that is not fair. This clause in here is no harm, will do no injury whatsoever, but it safeguards a man who wants to join any labor organization from being expelled or put out of the Socialist Party for that reason. We have gone on record here as being in favor of insisting upon members of the Socialist Party belonging to labor organizations, and why are we afraid of putting a clause in there so that no man can be denied the right given him to belong, when we ask him to belong. I think it is a very sensible thing to put it in. It can injure nobody and may be a benefit. In case a man was denied the right to go into a local, if this clause is in there he has a good cause to appeal to the membership at large of the state for protection, and if they would not give it he could appeal to the membership of the United States.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I want to speak against the amendment, and in speaking I will use the argument of Comrade Bessemer himself. He shows you the membership card of a comrade that has been a member of the party, and he tried to join the party again. As a matter of fact, he has been a member of the party all the time, and only has to go and pay his dues and he will be a member in good standing and will not require a new application. It is not a good argument to say you are going to insert something new in the Constitution. If we are going to make an amendment to cover every particular case, then we might as well provide what kind of clothes he shall wear in order to belong to the party. As to the objection raised by Comrade Bessemer in regard to appealing

to the state organization, there is plenty of opportunity to cover all that.

The question was then put on the Bessemer amendment, and it was lost.

DEL. MALKIEL (N. Y.): I move to insert after "political action" the words "for both men and women." (Seconded.)

DEL. LONDON (N. Y.): I rise to a point of order. The amendment is meaningless.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. You will decide on that by voting on it.

DEL. MALKIEL: I have made this amendment for this reason: Last year when the Woman's National Committee had the petition that Comrade Berger presented in Congress, we found that there were people who refused to sign it. We had circulated the petition among our party membership, and more than once we were confronted with our party members who refused to sign the petition, on the ground that they did not believe in woman suffrage. In our platforms we have declared for equal suffrage for both men and women for the last thirty or forty years or more, and it has remained until now. The time has come when woman suffrage, woman's enfranchisement, is a live issue. If we stand for it, let the men and women joining the party pledge themselves to support it. I ask you to accept that, but I think the delegates will vote in favor of it.

DEL. RODRIGUEZ (Ill.): I want to speak against the amendment. A person may be a member of the Socialist Party and may oppose woman suffrage. I have spoken in favor of it at women's meetings time and time again. I have always advocated it, at all times and in all places. I think there should be such a plank in the Socialist platform, and when an applicant for membership in the Socialist Party signs his name he agrees with the platform of the party, but the question of woman suffrage, in my opinion, is not a fundamental question of the class struggle. In other words, I do not believe that in order for a man to believe that the class struggle is in existence and that it is necessary for him to organize politically in order to capture the powers of government—I do not believe that he must agree necessarily that that is impossible unless he also favors woman suffrage. I believe our constitutional requirements should be broad enough to permit men and women to be members of the party even if they do not see fit to agree with me on woman suffrage. There are men in the Socialist Party that I know who do not favor woman suffrage, and I honestly believe that they are good Socialists; but for various reasons they do not favor it. We have some comrades in this convention that do not agree with the immediate demands in our platform. We agree with the platform, but I do not believe it should be made a requirement in our Constitution that a man should absolutely say, "I believe in woman suffrage" before he can be admitted to membership in the Socialist Party.

DEL. SPARGO: I want to offer an amendment. The amendment I offer is this: To amend the latter part of the article which reads "and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist party, including political action" by deleting the last three words, and to insert the words "platform and" before "principles," so that it will read, "and subscribes to the platform and principles of the Socialist party, shall be eligible to membership in the party." If I get a second I will explain why.

(Amendment Seconded.)

DEL. SPARGO: I think that it is entirely superfluous to say "any person who

subscribes to the principles of the party, including political action." Where we have had a controversy in our party between those who say that the Socialist party ought to turn to Sabotage, a direct action—where we have had a controversy—

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): A point of order. Comrade Spargo is not talking to the motion. He is introducing irrelevant matter here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Spargo is talking to his motion.

DEL. SPARGO: Where we have had that discussion, when I have said to comrades, "You are violating the decalogue," they have turned back to it and said, "Here is the article which provides the terms of admission to the party and membership in the party, and it says 'including political action.'" What does that mean if it does not mean that there are other kinds of action sanctioned by the party? I have heard men stand up to defend Sabotage and say, "So long as I believe in political action of some kind, I am within my right in the Socialist party in advocating Sabotage." I want this party today to go on record not that political action is subordinate in our party, in its platform, in its rules. I want it to take this position: We are a political party, and any person who comes into the political party must of necessity accept the principle of political action as a condition of membership. I know why it was inserted in 1908. I know the abnormal condition under which that sentence was introduced into that rule. But I tell you that what we ought to demand of every applicant for membership in the Socialist party is an unqualified declaration that he accepts the principles of the Socialist party as set forth in its platform and its program. (Applause.)

DEL. HILLQUIT: The reason why I speak against this proposition is not that I disagree with the spirit of Comrade Spargo's remarks, but because I think his motion does not properly carry out the spirit in which it is made. We have now in our platform a demand for political action to be recognized by applicants before they can be qualified for membership. The striking out of that phrase will be and should be interpreted as dispensing with that requirement. (Applause.) Now, we are not dispensing with this requirement. Furthermore, the substitution of "platform," so as to make the section read that the candidate subscribes to the platform and principles, is near repetition. The principles are expressed in the platform.

A DELEGATE: Not at all. They are also expressed in the resolutions.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Well, I think our platform does represent our principles. If it does not, I do not know what does. I think our principles are expressed in our platform. I therefore think we would best leave it in as it is.

The amendment of Del. Spargo was lost. Del. Goebel moved the adoption of the section as read. Seconded.

DEL. MALEY (Wash.): I rise to propose an amendment covering the intention of Comrade Malkiel but inserting after the words "political action" the phrase "and unrestricted political rights for both sexes."

The motion was seconded.

DEL. MALEY: I don't expect that this amendment will be carried. But I bring the matter before the convention with the hope that the necessity for any member of the Socialist party of America bringing such an amendment to our party conven-

tion shall be made forever unnecessary. The fact of the matter is this, that Del. Malkiel of New York knows exactly where she hails from and what she is talking about. She asks for an amendment including women's rights in our party pledge because there are Socialist locals that have refused to sign women's suffrage petitions that were presented to Congress by Comrade Berger this year. I speak not as a woman, not as a feminist. I speak as a party man (loud cheers) and an organization man (cheers) when I tell you that if you don't put your women into this fight the capitalists will do it for you; and they will put not only the women into this fight, but there will be unrestricted suffrage for the negroes of the south, and for every element in this nation that your masters think can be used as a plug to destroy you as a political factor. I certainly trust that we shall have at least a strong expression from this convention to the effect that no man is a Socialist—get it?—no man is a Socialist, and I give it back to Rodriguez; he is not a Socialist, he is only a half baked politician if he stands against the right of women to vote, or puts on the back any other half baked working man who stands against the right of his working class sister to come into the political field and make her fight for justice.

DEL. RODRIGUEZ (Ill.): I rise to a matter of personal privilege.

(Cries of "take the platform.")

DEL. RODRIGUEZ: I don't desire to take the platform at all. I think you can all hear me, and I think if Comrade Maley had listened before she would have heard me and understood me. It seems that she did not. I have always stood for universal suffrage, but in view of the remarks of Comrade Maley perhaps it is necessary to repeat what I said before. I have always stood, ever since I became a member of this party for equal and unrestricted rights for men and women. My wife happens to be a member of this party; every one of my wife's family are for women's suffrage, and all of my family are for women's suffrage. What I said was this, that I did not believe that it was absolutely necessary as a requirement before any man became a member of the party that he should first unrestrictedly and absolutely believe that woman should have an equal ballot with man. That is what I said. Furthermore I said that we should have a plank in our platform declaring for equal rights for men and women. I am sorry that Comrade Maley did not hear that. I stand just as strongly for woman's suffrage as does Comrade Maley.

DEL. MENG (Ark.): He did say a man could be a good Socialist and opposed to woman's suffrage.

DEL. MALKIEL (N. Y.): I want to say that Delegate Rodriguez did say that a man could be a good Socialist and not believe in equal suffrage.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): The statement has been made on this floor that a branch in Local New York is opposed to woman's suffrage because they refused to sign a petition that was to be presented by Comrade Berger. If there was such a branch the reason they did not sign such a petition was because they were utterly opposed to the idea of petitioning a capitalist congress to grant the vote to women; they did not believe that anything could be achieved by petitioning. That does not show that there is any local in New York opposed to giving woman political equality with man.

The amendment by Comrade Maley to insert the words "and unrestricted political rights for both sexes" was carried.

A division being called for the chairman said:

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment you have just carried is to insert the words "and unrestricted political rights for both sexes," after the words "political action." A division has been called for.

DEL. ENDRES (N. Y.): I believe there are a good many of us who do not understand this situation. What does the introduction of this clause mean?

THE CHAIRMAN: There should not be any doubt about what this means but the secretary will read it again. Read the whole section as amended.

THE SECRETARY (reading): "Article 2, Section 1. Every person, resident of the United States of the age of 18 years and upwards without discrimination as to sex, race, color or creed who has severed his connection with all other political parties and subscribe to the principles of the Socialist party, including political action, and unrestricted political rights for both sexes, shall be eligible to membership in the party."

Upon a division the amendment by Comrade Maley was carried; 135 aye, 86 no.

DEL. BESSEMER (Ohio): Are not the committee willing to change the word "his" to "their"?

THE CHAIRMAN: The masculine pronoun carries both sexes according to the Chair's interpretation.

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): Do I understand that on every amendment that comes before the convention now on this article there can be no more than two speeches?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the Chair's understanding.

DEL. WILSON: I object. Every amendment that comes as a distinct motion on every one of these sections ought to be open to debate until the previous question is called.

DEL. BRUCE (Pa.): I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: An appeal has been taken. The question is, shall the Chair be sustained.

DEL. WHEELER (Cal.): At the early part of the session the presiding officer ruled that when an amendment offered by one of the delegates was before the house and another delegate offered an amendment the Chair ruled that in order not to confuse the question they would deal with one amendment at a time; and when that amendment was disposed of the other amendment could be put. That was the ruling of the Chair. That was the absolute understanding of every delegate in the house. And whether the Chair ruled otherwise or not I hold it is simply fair that every amendment should be open to discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair simply understands that the previous question being ordered, amendments are still in order, but the discussion is limited. I simply act under my understanding of the rule.

On a division the decision of the Chair was overruled.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am every glad to hear it.

DEL. PATTERSON (Ohio): I ask that the committee include the following words, and I offer as an amendment if they won't accept it that at the end of the first clause where it says "membership in the party," add the words "of the state in which he is a resident."

The motion was seconded.
 DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): A point of information. Does the four hour rule apply to the report of this committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it does.
 DEL. HOGAN: I want to say then that we have consumed two hours already in the discussion of the first section and at this rate we will never get anywhere.

DEL. PATTERSON: The reason I bring this to your attention is that on many occasions men who have been expelled from the membership in one state have gone over the border line into the next state and joined the organization in that state. A member being denied membership at Toledo, Ohio, went down into Florida, and there he has exploited the Socialists by selling swamp lands, after joining the Local, as I was told by a member of this convention—a Local which has since perished, and which only worked harm to the bona fide Socialist organization while it existed. That member was taken into membership in Florida, and there is no provision at the present time to prevent his being taken in, by making it compulsory that a state shall only accept those who are residents of the state. Residence qualifications are determined politically, so there is no trouble about that, and by making it binding that a man is only eligible in the state in which he votes you save the organization all kinds of trouble. On the other hand, there is nothing preventing that fellow from posing as a Socialist, holding a Socialist card in the party Local, opposing the regularly organized Socialist party, or becoming a candidate for office.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): If we are going to do this thing let's do it right, let us take each individual word in this constitution and submit an amendment to it. I am not here to fight for this committee, but I am a member of the committee and I know that we have done our duty. I know there has not been a point presented so far that was not carefully considered and debated in the committee. The last comrade for instance, seems to forget that we have a provision in the constitution reiterated year after year that the membership of each state shall have absolute control over its own membership. If a state can not take care of this thing the state ought to have all the trouble coming to it so far as I am concerned. We have had this provision year after year and the party has not gone to smash. The party is stronger today, immensely stronger than ever before, and if you take up every article in the constitution that we have been living under for years and try to amend them word for word, what are you going to do with the new provisions that are vital to the life of this organization. Let us get down to business. Vote down this amendment and consider something that is essential.

DEL. BOSWELL (W. Va.): I move that the motion be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was carried.

DEL. EDWARDS: I move that Section 1, Article 2, be adopted as amended by Comrade Maley. And upon that I move the previous question.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): I think this motion is unnecessary. I think the Chair ought to adopt the rule that where there are no objections to a section the Chairman ought to declare the report of the committee accepted as was done with the report of the Platform Committee.

Section 1, Article 2 was then adopted as amended.

Section 2, Article 2 was then read.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I move to strike out in the first sentence the words "without the consent of the state organization," and that the next sentence shall read, "No party member shall be a candidate for public office of any party other than the Socialist party."

THE SECRETARY: Del. Bostrom of Washington offers this amendment: That the section shall read, "No person occupying a position honorary or remunerative by gift of any party other than the Socialist party (civil service positions excepted) and no person whose principal source of income is derived from rent, interest and profit, shall be eligible to membership in the Socialist party. No party member shall be a candidate for public office without the consent of the city, county or state organization according to the nature of the office."

DEL. BOSTROM: The Socialist party proclaims itself to be the political expression of the interests of the working class. In the platform debate last night we had an expression like this, "All political parties are the expression of economic class interests," and in another place, "The Socialist party is the political expression of the economic interests of the workers." You say this in one breath and in the next breath you are willing to accept into the party capitalists, people whose interests are practically antagonistic to the interests of the working class. I know that the plea is made that members coming in here are sincere although they may be connected with the Rockefeller interests, but he comes in here because he is carried away by the speech of Comrade Spargo or some other great orator of the party. But you know that every trouble that exists anywhere comes from the clash of economic interests. You know that was the trouble right here last night on the immediate demands. You see it there. Immediate demands are for the benefit of the tax paying class, for the farmers, for the business man. In the twelve years that I have been in the Socialist party I have noticed that economic determinism operates in the decision of questions in the Socialist party as everywhere else. The only cause of disturbance in this party has been economic interests. You can not make a party out of a lion and a lamb. I tell you that earnest as a man may be, sincere as a man may be when his economic interests are concerned he is going to look out for them. I realize that the opinion of this convention is not in favor of this amendment. I don't expect it to carry, but I do want every man here recorded as standing for or against the working class on this question and I shall demand a roll call on my amendment.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): I move to table the motion of Delegate Bostrom.

The motion to table was carried.

DEL. NAGLE (Okla.): I wish to call the attention of the delegate from New York that when he asks to strike out the words "without the consent of the state organization," if that amendment is carried then no Socialist can accept office under any circumstances. Now in Oklahoma and other southwestern states we have what is called the Goble election law; and they have what is called a state election board, a county election board and a precinct election board. If that amendment is carried we are entirely at the mercy of the state election board. We may possibly get representation on those elec-

tion boards if that article stands as it is written by the committee. The same thing is true of the second amendment. In many of the states they have the commission form of government. If that section, as read is allowed to stand then we will be able to get action politically under the commission form of government, but if you amend it as the second amendment suggests we are cut off from that. Now it is evident that the committee—I am not acquainted with any of them except by reputation—but it is evident that they were broad enough to understand the entire situation; and I ask in behalf of our state especially that that section be allowed to stand just as written and it will amply protect us under the election laws of the state.

DEL. HICKEY (Tex.): I move that the last words of section 2 read as follows—that the following words be added: "And no member holding political office shall hold an executive office in the party at the same time."

The motion was seconded.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): This amendment does not belong here. We are not discussing eligibility to office. That comes under a separate section. If we want to preserve order in debate let us take up the different subjects logically.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is well taken.

DEL. HILLQUIT: As to Comrade Slobodin's amendment, if you adopt that it would prohibit the acceptance of any appointive office, whether the state organization of the Socialist party was in favor of accepting it or not. What the committee had in mind was certain instances that were cited to it. One is mentioned by Comrade Nagle, where a mayor of the city or other officer may appoint a Socialist election official, not because the law compels him to do so, in which case it would not be a gift, but because in fairness, in recognition of the growth and importance of the Socialist movement he feels that that would be the proper thing to do. Under this amendment he would have to decline it no matter whether the state committee or the local committee of the party deemed it of the utmost importance. Another instance was a case in Illinois where the governor had the appointing of a commission on workmen's compensation, to investigate that subject. A position on that commission was offered to a member of the party, a labor union man who accepted it. Under the old constitution he accepted it in violation of the constitution, and the state committee of Illinois closed one eye to it. It was perfectly proper that he should accept, but it should not be left to him alone to determine. It was up to the state committee to determine and this section would give the state committee power to determine in what cases he might sit on industrial commissions, for instance, that are being appointed in all the states, where it is highly important that if the Socialist party can be represented they should be represented, not to compromise, but on the contrary to bring out the most radical proposition that can be obtained. We don't want to cut off this possibility. If it should be a purely political office we have guarded against that in other sections, and it can not be done without the consent of the state organization, and none of you expect a state organization of the Socialist party to consent to the accepting of a purely political office.

On this second point I think Slobodin misapprehended the object of it. He said it was self evident. It is just the contrary. We provide that no party member shall be a candidate for a political office without the consent of the Socialist organization. He wants it to read "The candidate of any other party than the Socialist party." Our object was to restrict the rights of a member to become a candidate claiming to represent the Socialist party, without the consent of the organization. Under the laws of several states the selection of candidates does not rest with the party organization but rests with bodies of voters who call themselves Socialist voters at the primaries, and thus a party member who does not answer the qualification and is not desired by the party may get himself nominated on that ticket by persons not constituting the party organization of the state. So that we provide that no one can accept the position on even a Socialist party ticket without the consent of the local or state organization.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I will speak now. I have been national secretary, state secretary, in every position in the party from national committeeman down; I know the politics of the party thoroughly. I say it is not in the interest of the party that any member of the party should take an appointive office, even when given by capitalist politicians. It is not in the interest of the working class. It is against the interests of the working class. I do not say that every man who accepts such an office will work against the interest of the working class deliberately; but it is against the interest of the working class in that it confuses class lines. I know that Mayor Gaynor would readily offer prominent Socialists that I have in mind a position on some committee, for the purpose of representing, we will say, the interests of the working class; but if he accepts it will finally be against the interests of the working class insofar as it tends to confuse the class lines and insofar as the working class will be taught that they can accept benefits from the capitalist politicians. That is why it should be prohibited absolutely. As to the second point, that was not intended for this purpose at all. If it was intended to prohibit Socialists from accepting offices in the Socialist party without the consent of the state or local organization that would be a good provision. The provision which I referred to is another one. It is a better one, and this is the reason for it, that they shall not accept any public office, or stand as candidates for any public office, other than in the Socialist party. The first provision is not necessary in the national constitution. That may be left to the state organization to deal with. If a party member not nominated by your state or local organization designedly stands as a candidate at the primary election, or stands as a candidate against the decision of your local or state organization you yourselves will know how to deal with it. The provision which I contend is this that he shall not be a candidate of any party or organization other than the Socialist party.

The amendment of Delegate Slobodin was then defeated, and Section 2 of Article 2 was passed as reported by the committee.

DEL. WHEELER (Cal.): Will the committee consent to put in the sixth line without the consent of the state or local organization?

DEL. HILLQUIT: The committee declines.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee has refused your request. The section as reported is adopted. Proceed with the next section.

Article 2, Section 3 was then adopted as read.

Article 2, Section 4 was also adopted without objection.

Article 2, Section 5 was adopted without objection.

Article 2, Section 6 was then read.

DEL. GARVER (Mo.): I move to amend by striking out the words "against the person" in the second line and inserting the word "sabotage." As amended it will then read "Any member of the party who opposes political action or advocates crime, sabotage, or other methods of violence as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation, shall be expelled from membership in the party." I desire to say that the qualifying words "against the person" imply that if the crime is against property it might be permitted. Under such a construction we might be considered as advocates of arson; under that construction we might be considered advocates of dynamite; under that construction we might be considered advocates of railroad wrecking. I contend that it is high time for this convention to take a distinct stand and declare that it is opposed to every form of crime and violence (great cheering). Why this committee composed as it is of representative men of the convention should put in a qualifying clause implying that crime must be against the person to be denounced I can not understand. You all know that Jim McNamara said that he didn't intend to kill any one in Los Angeles; that he simply intended to injure the building that was blown up. I want to say that that line can not be drawn. It is high time that this convention should go on record on this subject. In inserting this word "sabotage" I will say that I have been asked the meaning of the word. The meaning that I have in mind was given to me by one that was qualified to define it, a member of this convention having the right to a voice and vote. I think it is pretty thoroughly understood and that there will be no confusion in the mind of any delegate and that this amendment will be adopted.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I move to strike out this whole section 6. The last delegate in his remarks has proven that he is not clear in his own mind as to what he wants done. He has admitted that there is a question as to what the word sabotage means. Yesterday afternoon the delegates in this convention did the greatest thing that was ever done in the history of the Socialist party. Now after you have adopted a section to which we all agreed, that the members of the Socialist party must stand for political action in every sense, is somebody going to drag in something here, raise a bugaboo and overthrow everything that we did yesterday? That section of Article 2 should be stricken out.

A DELEGATE: The syndicalists will have to go.

DEL. MERRICK: The proposition of what is meant by violence, and what is meant by these different terms would be dragged in here; there will be recriminations back and forth. I want to say to you that it is absolutely superfluous, and even if you thought it ought to go in it should not be in that section but should be in Article 2, Section 1. It has no relevancy here whatever. It is entirely superfluous

and is a proposition that will make serious dissension in the convention, and then when you are through you won't be agreed on it then. Every delegate in the convention will have a different idea what it means. You will go back to your state wrangling and jangling over that section. I predict there won't be a member in any local who will agree with any other member as to what this meant when it went in. Let us all get together and strike out this section. Let us proceed in the spirit that was manifested yesterday afternoon and last night.

DEL. STALLARD (Kan.): I wish to move and to speak in support of the amendment, that we strike out the following words, "or advocates crime against the person or other methods of violence."

THE CHAIRMAN: That amendment is out of order. We have two amendments now.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I expected this exact motion. The situation developed yesterday was too smooth. It was so general, so all inclusive—

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate must speak to the subject. I do not propose to permit the speakers to wander so far afield from the subject.

DEL. GAYLORD: Now, Mr. Chairman, I am a judge of words, and I know that I am talking to the subject.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, do so, and go ahead.

DEL. GAYLORD: I am doing so, if you will keep quiet and let me.

Comrades, I say it, and I say again, because it is pertinent that the situation yesterday called for more definition. It was understood very well by those who knew the forces at work in this convention that the moment must come, before we left this hall to go home, when there should be a definition of what was meant in this resolution. We will have it; and so will you. I shall not consent, nor will the Wisconsin delegation, to leave in the platform and constitution of this party any uncertain phrases which will be interpreted one way by one group and another way by another group; and in this way lay the foundation for interminable turmoil and disagreement, confusion and the destruction at the wrong time, of this organization.

A DELEGATE: I would like to know what the delegate from Wisconsin is talking about.

THE CHAIRMAN: He is talking to the motion to substitute—

DEL. GAYLORD: I am talking to the motion to strike out the whole paragraph. That is what I said I was talking about, and I am not going to be confused about that.

I am sorry the committee put in those words "against the person." The distinction has well been made on the floor of the convention already, that the crime against property is a thing that this party cannot stand for. No crime. We cannot stand for any crime. We definitely repudiate crime of any kind; and since the question has been raised we dare not evade an absolutely definite expression on that point.

However, to go further and to come immediately within the range of that which the chairman will doubtless understand, neither dare we permit our party organization to present its principles, the basis of this organization, the platform and program, to the people of this country, to the working class, who are looking for something that is clear cut, except in language that is decisive and easily understood. Neither dare we present ourselves to them in language

concerning it which is of doubtful interpretation. I for one shall not and cannot stand for any quibbling and evasion. I know whereof I speak when I speak of quibbling and evasion. In the mountains of Pennsylvania have I met it. Out on the coast, in halls hired by the Socialist party for me to speak in, have I met it. All the way in between, from the prairies of Texas far up into the factory districts of the cities have I met it. I know what I am talking about when I talk about quibbling and evasion, and uses of words that are given double meanings. No. We know what we want. A political party having for its principles and foundation the acquirement and intelligent use of political power. And those whom I have met, and they are on this floor, those whom I have met who have quibbled about this, evaded, and split hairs when they were in my presence and afterwards were plain enough to suit the devil himself, these cannot fool me. You fool others but you cannot fool me. I know what the workers of this nation are talking about. They do not stand for crimes against property, not even in the name of the labor unions. Crimes against property are all closely identified physically with danger to life of the working men. We want no chances taken. Property is a thing that we use. The use of it is our livelihood. The use of it properly is our labor, our living. Property is the product of human labor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

On motion Del. Gaylord's time was extended five minutes, and he proceeded:

Now, to come just to the point, I stand for striking out the words "against the person," and inserting the word "sabotage." Some will object that they do not know what that word means. I did not originate its use. Let us take the use of it as they do, subtle and insinuating and suggestive rather than definitive. Let us take the meaning and meanings and all the meanings given the word. We do not want any of it. None of it. We don't want the touch of it on us. We do not want the hint of it connected with us. We repudiate it in every fibre of us. I know it is capable of double meanings, just because those who have adopted its use ask us "what do you mean by sabotage?" What do we mean? We mean what you mean, and we do not want it. Political action undertaken as a method of the working class battle, accepts for the time being the present definition of crime. It includes and implies the right of the majority to change its definitions of crime in so far as we may be able when we have the power, according to such light and knowledge as may come to us on the basis of our experience, but for the present, for the maintaining of the social order which we have, and under which we live, and under which we must live, for the maintaining of such personal safeguards for liberty and life, and the pursuit of happiness as we have, and I am frank to say that I prefer to take those that we have rather than ask for those which may not be granted by the advocates of direct action and sabotage. These safeguards we know and understand. They do not suit us and we propose to increase them, to increase the personal use of personal liberty, the personal use of personal powers, but we do not propose to destroy them. Though they do not suit us they are protections in some degree. We propose to increase expression in them by increasing the imperfect facilities of social action for the common welfare. This is my understanding of the matter, and in

this I feel safe in saying that I speak for the comrades from Wisconsin.

DEL. S. SADLER (Wash.): Probably I won't have the beautiful flow of language or use as many words as the delegate from Wisconsin has used. I am in absolute harmony with the clause in the constitution brought forward by the committee. I am also in harmony with the amendment proposed by the comrade here, putting in the word "sabotage."

A DELEGATE: What are you talking about, then?

DEL. SADLER: I object to any individual attacking any member of this organization by misrepresentation and words that do not mean anything.

A DELEGATE: What do you mean? Who is talking?

THE CHAIRMAN: Order in the house. Let the Chair regulate this. The comrade will talk to the motion or yield the floor.

DEL. SADLER: I will speak to the motion. Comrades, there is no subtle meaning to the phrase as has been suggested by the delegate from Wisconsin. There are no two members of the Socialist party who agree on the word sabotage. Not only that, but I think it is out of place in the Socialist constitution and political organization, striving to get political power. For this reason: The Socialist party, a political organization, has no use for sabotage, crime, or anything else of that kind. As a political organization it is not within our jurisdiction to use sabotage, and therefore it has no place in our programme. It is only an economic organization that can use it, and not a political organization. Therefore, it seems to me, out of place, and I am sure that the committee was intelligent enough, broad enough, and had experience enough to know that if it had a place in there they would have put it in. So, therefore, I am opposed to the insertion of the word "sabotage" in our constitution.

DEL. GOEBEL: I am speaking now as an individual and not as a member of the committee. On the committee we were divided on the use of that word "sabotage." Those are the members of the committee who were better trained in English, used a term that they said meant the same thing, so that after all there was no real division. I think that all nine members of the committee stood directly against that thing that is meant by those who use the word "sabotage." For myself, I know that I stand against it. This is a political organization. If we are a political organization and stand for certain things, and do not stand for certain other things, let us say so. Why not? What is lost by being honest? Now, I am perfectly frank in telling you what I am after, what I am driving at. I want to say that when a man speaks for the Socialist party, in a hall which is paid for by Socialists, that he ought to talk what we mean by Socialism. (Applause.) I speak again, as Comrade Gaylord spoke, from bitter experience. I have traveled in the service of this Socialist party in practically every part of the United States, and what do I find? I find the movement in locality after locality disorganized, I find them fighting amongst themselves. Why? Because men have come into the Socialist party and instead of advocating the principles and tactics of the Socialist political organization, they have advocated the tactics of an economic organization—sabotage. This is the point, get it. If they are amongst those that want to talk sabotage, let them go out on an-

other platform and talk it. I for one much as I disagree with them, am perfectly frank to say it. Sabotage means jack-ass methods of fighting capitalism. In the end it spells but the philosophy of anarchism, the philosophy of the individualist that takes upon himself to know better than the organization, the collectivity, can know. To me, it is a jack-ass method of fighting capitalism.

But after that, and this is the only question before the house, shall we say what we mean by political organization, and thereby make it possible for the good loyal comrades all over the country to have an interpretation that will enable them to say whether a member of the party is talking political organization, or whether they are advocating what they are pleased to call the economic weapon in the fight against capitalism.

Now, what did happen in regard to those resolutions, precisely the same resolutions that were adopted four years ago, on labor organizations? We have seen that some of our comrades got up on this platform, and approving these same resolutions that were adopted two years ago—four years ago—they have put on them an interpretation that would allow them to go out tomorrow and say, "They endorsed sabotage; they have endorsed all that we have been doing and saying in the name of Socialism." It was as smooth a political trick as I have ever seen in a political convention in all my experience. What I shall do in my economic organization, what I am liable to do, that is my business. It is not a subject for discussion here; but, what I shall do in the political organization as an expression of my economic interest, is a subject for discussion here. This is what we are trying to say: Do we believe in sabotage as a weapon along political lines? If not, let us say so.

DEL. MAX HAYES of Cleveland: What I have to say I will try to make very brief. I understand that it costs something like \$500 an hour to conduct this convention. I haven't taken much time and I don't intend to take any more than I can help. When I came to this convention as a delegate elected by Socialists in the city of Cleveland, I believed that I was coming to a gathering that was purely political in its nature, that this is a political party, a political organization, with which we are affiliated that has no right to dictate to or take part in the affairs, the politics, or principles of organizations on the economic

field. But apparently there is a spirit growing in the Socialist Party that sooner or later, in the not very distant future, unless we proceed along the same lines that the Socialists throughout the civilized world who are in the vanguard in the political movement to overthrow capitalism, and that adhere to the same principles and policies that we do, that have been a success in these other nations than we are, as I say, confronted by a new spirit that has arisen which attempts to draw the political organization in behind the economic organization. In some parts of the country this spirit is rapidly developing to the anarchistic point where if men like Johann Most were still on earth, they would undoubtedly make application to join. I want you comrades, and particularly those of you who have not practical experience in the every day struggles in the industrial field, to go slow, and I refer particularly to some of our so-called parlor variety of Socialists. Some of the intellectuals who have never been in the labor movement, but sit in their parlors and theorize and write books that tell the industrial workers what to do. The point that I wish to make is simply this: You yesterday adopted a declaration regarding the matter of organization on the industrial field, which certainly ought to be satisfactory to every right thinking, honest-minded man and woman in the Socialist movement. Let us stand by that. Keep your hands off the A. F. of L. Keep your hands off the I. W. W. Keep your hands off any labor organization. As far as the A. F. of L. is concerned, no resolution that you would adopt here would be sufficient to drive me to join the I. W. W. if I didn't see fit to do so. We can take care of our own affairs on the industrial field. We do not want you to butt in. Leave the industrial field to the unions.

THE CHAIRMAN: The original motion is the adoption of the report of the committee, Article 2, Section 6. An amendment is offered by Garver of Missouri, to strike out in this particular section the words "against the person," and to insert the word "sabotage" in the same place. The amendment to the amendment is offered by Merrick of Pennsylvania to strike out the entire section. That is the status quo just now.

The convention will be adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.

Whereupon the convention adjourned until 2:30 o'clock p. m., same day.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Chairman Duncan called the convention to order at 2:30 p. m. Consideration of the Constitution was resumed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is on the amendment offered by Del. Garver of Missouri, to strike from Section 6 the words "against the person," and insert the word "Sabotage," and on the substitute offered by Del. Merrick of Pennsylvania to strike out the entire Section 6. The Chair recognizes Del. Berlyn of Illinois.

DEL. BARNES (Pa.): I wish to make a motion relating to the special order. You know that this afternoon at three o'clock, according to the previous action, we are going to nominate candidates for President and Vice-President. I wish to make this motion: That when we take up the nominations, a roll call of states be made, giving each state an opportunity to nominate. (Seconded.)

DEL. SPARGO: I offer an amendment to the motion. The amendment is that instead of going into the nominations at three o'clock, we go into the nominations as soon as the business before us is disposed of, that is, as soon as the report of the Constitution Committee is disposed of.

DEL. BARNES: I accept that.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I offer a substitute that we have a special session tonight, beginning at eight o'clock, the special order of which shall be the nomination of presidential and vice-presidential candidates.

On motion of Del. Prevey of Ohio the motion of Del. Barnes was laid on the table.

CONSTITUTION.

Consideration of the Constitution was then resumed.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I desire to state to the comrades that this is the time for clearness. The motion to strike out that entire paragraph is liable to becloud. There have been aspersions cast that we are yellow. We want to go on record where we stand. I am in favor of putting the word "sabotage" in. I will vote with the committee if they will consent to it and I will tell you why. I know what sabotage means. I know why I became a Socialist. I was a trade unionist before I was a Socialist, and the methods used by the trade unionists did not appeal to me, and I wanted a better way. "Sabotage" comes from the French word "sabot," wooden shoes—putting the boots to them. Now, you will say that is one definition. That is true.

What does "boycott" mean, and where did it come from? It is Irish, and it meant Englishman who was oppressing the Irish, and they set an example of isolation. Everybody understands now what Captain Boycott stands for—boycott. And today "sabotage" has its positive significance just the same.

Now I am not trying to dictate to the economic movement. When they will come in actual contact with the capitalist class they will adopt such methods and manners of fighting as they deem proper. That is their business, and I do not want to interfere with them, but as a Socialist who has found a better way, in our party, when this thing has been thrust on us we should have the courage to say where we stand. There is no duck-

ing in this. I won't duck. The Socialist party is organized. It has a better way, because it tries to do things for the whole working class—and the best that the economic movement does is to carry on a guerilla warfare. But that is the evidence of the class struggle. We should not suppress them, and in all their struggles, whatever they do, they do what seems right to them, and we will give them support. But that does not permit a man to preach sabotage or violence from our platform.

We make the propaganda for the capture of the public powers, to realize the declaration of principles and the various planks in our platform. What we Socialists appeal to the workmen to do is to unite and get all you can until you get all. And to do this, and to speak plain English, is not yellow.

To some of these boys who talk about being yellow, I would like to say if they were in some of the scrapes that I was they would know something about who is yellow and who is not. Ask the boys in Colorado, when I went out there six years ago, if I was yellow, if I didn't go anywhere, wherever they told me. I would go to hell if they told me. Isn't that so, Floaten? I went to Trinidad and I went to Cripple Creek, and I was the first fellow that spoke there after the deportations. I didn't hesitate. I had the gun put to my nose in Chicago, and I made fun of the fellow that did it. But that is neither here nor there. The question is a question of party policy. We are striving to realize ideals and propositions responsive to the needs and aspirations of the working class. There are elements that have intruded and have used our party as a stalking place to preach anarchy. I won't weaken and we won't have anarchy preached in our platform. We are not going to do it.

DEL. CASSIDY (N. Y.): In my opinion there have been, during my eleven years in the Socialist party, different times when our movement has been threatened from two different directions. At one time it seemed as if it was threatened from the opportunist end. But I want to say tonight—and I am not usually a positivist on most things—that the great danger, the tremendous danger that faces the movement today is from the end that smacks of, that smells of violence and anarchy. (Applause.) I want, comrades, to give you some facts to show you how imminent this danger is to the movement at this time. Most of you have read about the May day demonstration and parade in Union Square, New York, on the first day of this month, and what happened at that meeting. I was the Chairman of that meeting, and I think I can speak with authority. What happened? In the first place, I want to precede this by telling you that for years the New York Socialists and labor organizations have combined in a conference and have carried out a parade on the first of May, which was followed by a mass meeting, usually in Union Square. Heretofore we have had no trouble Heretofore the anarchists have kept their hands off. The most they have done has been to stand on the sidewalk as we passed by on parade, to stand on the edge of the crowd, sneering at us; because we have no more bitter and vicious enemies today than the anarchists. (Applause.) When the parade arrived in

Union Square, I was on the platform, about as big as this platform here, with a little projecting space about as big as this for the speaker.

DEL. BESSMER (Ohio): A point of order. Are we discussing what happened in New York, or this amendment to strike this out?

THE CHAIRMAN: I rule that the comrade is talking to the question, and citing this as an illustration of the point he wishes to make.

DEL. CASSIDY: No unusual preparation had been made for this meeting. We did not anticipate, we did not suspect what happened that day. There were two entrances to the platform. When the meeting was about to open, the anarchists, about fifty or sixty of them, all Italian immigrants, began to act. Fifteen or twenty, like a big wedge, came up the stairway on this side. Another fifteen or twenty rushed up on this side of the platform. As our platform was a little higher than this from the ground, they climbed up to the top and took possession of the speakers' stand. I realized that we were up against something. I realized that that was a moment that might have been turned into another Haymarket affair and used to discredit the Socialist movement throughout this country. (Applause.) I went to these men standing on the platform and taking the full space up. I went to the first man and said, "I am Chairman of this meeting, and I ask you to stand back for the speakers." He says, "No, no, no, this is workingman's meeting." "Well," I says, "yes, that is true; this is a workingman's meeting, but we have got to have order at a workingman's meeting." "No, no, no, this workingman's meeting." I went and got three or four committeemen, and we came back again and pleaded with them and asked them to get back. They said no. The only answer was, "Workingman's meeting," and there was nothing too bitter, there was nothing too vile for them to hurl at the Socialist movement. Now, comrades, I am going to state that. Let me tell you another peculiar incident about this meeting, a significant incident. Heretofore at meetings the police department of New York has given us so many police that we were defended. There were police on the right, front and rear. But on this occasion, for some reason that you can guess at and attach whatever significance you like to it, there was no police on the platform. On this occasion, for the first time in the history of any kind of parade in New York, not even one policeman was sent along to escort the parade, and even the police along the road said, "What is the matter? Why haven't you got a police escort?" Under that situation we stayed there, and these ugly, vicious men stayed there. And you must remember that these men do not fight with their fists. They have a knife or worst of all, there is a bomb, for they are the class that want to use force. One of our committee said, "We can send out in the Square and get fifty husky trade union Socialists and throw them off the platform." I said, "No, let not one comrade hit anybody or do any act of violence." I was afraid, not for myself, but afraid for the movement. (Applause.) These men stayed there. The organizer of Local New York, Comrade Gerber, telephoned to police headquarters for men, but they sent us no men. The policeman in charge of the police employed in the Square refused to come on the platform. Under these con-

ditions I permitted these men to stay there as the best way out of the difficulty. Now, let me show you—(confusion, interrupting the speaker.) No, I am not going to waste your time; I am keeping straight to the point. I want to show you where we are drifting, unless we take a hitch-up. Why did these Italian anarchists have the courage to do something that they did not attempt before? Of course, a comrade here asks, "What did they do?" You have read the description. One of the things they did was to hiss at the speakers and so on. Another thing that they did was that a bunch of them in front said, "Take down that flag." I says, "What flag?" He says, "The American flag." I says, "You will not take it down, damn you; you will not take it down." (Applause.) And they wedged toward the flag, and we got our comrades and we stood back and held them back. I said, "Comrades, don't strike, don't strike." Because I did not think they would strike back with their fists. It might have been with a weapon, and then I did not know what might happen. We talked and argued with them, and finally appealed. Socialists tried to protect the flag, and anarchists tried to tear it down. It managed to go down, although it was not trampled by anybody. Now, to my point. Why did they get the courage to do that? Why? Let me show you, comrades. I am only giving you these facts the way I see the thing. When the Lawrence hunger strike started out it brought the Socialist party in connection with the local I. W. W. in New York, and it brought the I. W. W. in connection with the Italian Socialist Federation. The Italian Socialist Federation took these men as members. As to what we call the Italian Socialist Federation I will explain.

(Del. Carey of Massachusetts moved to extend the speaker's time five minutes.)

DEL. HICKEY (Tex.): A point of order. Under the rules the time for nominations is here now. It is three o'clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not yet three o'clock, the motion is that the time of the speaker be extended five minutes. In two minutes it will be three o'clock.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I move to amend that the time be extended two minutes.

The amendment was carried and the speaker's time was extended two minutes. DEL. CASSIDY: When the Lawrence strike broke out, what did we Socialists do? In every struggle of the working people for better conditions, we go to their rescue. In this particular case we came in contact with the local I. W. W. and through that with this Italian Socialist Federation. Now, let me explain what this Italian Socialist Federation is. The Italian Socialist Federation, so-called, is an organization that is not affiliated, nor can it be, nor does it desire to be, with the Socialist party in any respect. They frankly tell you that they are anarchists. The Italian anarchists, the Socialist Federation, took an active part in the Lawrence strike. They sent finances. They were the chief agency in bringing the Lawrence children to New York City. In that way many members of our party, through the I. W. W. got mixed up in this once case. Now, comrades, in this way is the danger. Now, about the local I. W. W. I am telling you facts now, and you can draw your own conclusion. When this attack on the Socialist party May day meeting was made, the local I. W. W. called a meeting, and a motion was

made at that meeting, that they repudiate the actions of these men who took the platform and threw down the national flag, and the vote repudiating the action of these men was taken, and it was only carried by a vote of 28 to 31.

DEL. ALEXANDER (Tex.): I move to suspend the rules and continue the discussion. (Seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I move to amend that we change the order of the day so that this pending discussion on this section of the Constitution shall be finished and disposed of before we proceed with the regular order. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: That motion has already been laid upon the table.

DEL. ALEXANDER: A point of order. There has been business transacted since the motion to lay on the table was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion at this time is that the rules be suspended and that we proceed with the discussion of this motion before the house, this particular section.

DEL. MERRICK: I wish to speak against suspending the rules.

DEL. ALEXANDER: I wish to speak for suspending the rules.

DEL. MERRICK: At the beginning of this convention, you recognized the importance of providing for the nominations at some definite time, in the interest of accomplishing the best interests of this convention. You knew that such situations as this were going to come, and that is the reason you put that rule in there. Now, are you going to change the whole order of business and bring about confusion here and produce a situation that your better judgment showed you at the beginning of this convention might follow? There were several motions and amendments made here for the purpose of placing the nominations earlier in the convention, and as a compromise you finally fixed Friday afternoon at three o'clock. Now that time is here. If you begin to suspend the rules I can tell you that you do not know what you are going to do or where you are going to land. Stick to the program and vote this down.

On motion of Del. Richardson (Cal.) the previous question was ordered.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): The way to do is to finish what you have in hand before you proceed to the next business. This Constitution is the result of five days' work in the committee, and the issues involved in this discussion are very likely to affect the decision of the convention, or to bear upon the decision, certainly, with reference to the nominations.

THE CHAIRMAN: As many as are in favor of suspending the rules and continuing the discussion will signify it by saying aye. Contrary, no. The Chair is in doubt.

DEL. KOOP (Ill.): A point of order. If the Chair would state that it only means this clause, I think we would all agree.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what the Chair stated.

DEL. KOOP: He did not state it the last time.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair did not state it the last time, because he supposed it was perfectly well understood that it means this section. As many as are in favor of suspending the rules and continuing this discussion until this section of the Constitution is disposed of will raise their hands. Those opposed will raise their hands. The motion is carried; for, 168; against, 41.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): I wish we might be able to discuss this particular clause without showing such prejudice in our discussion. This clause is very important to the working class. Many of those who have already spoken on this particular clause seem to think that we are now meeting the same issues in our movement as we did four, five or ten years ago. Let me call your attention to the fact that as the working class draw up closer and encroach more and more upon the material interests of the capitalist class, the class struggle is growing more intense. The capitalist class is going to devise new ways and means of beating down the power of the working class. The working class, on the other hand, as they realize that they must meet the greater power of the capitalist class, are also adopting new tactics. Now, then, we did not hear anything about Sabotage four years ago in our national convention. We did not know anything about the word. I do not know anything about it now, because I have not had occasion to fight in the ranks of the workers in a strike or anything of that kind. If I had, maybe I would know something about Sabotage. Let me call your attention to another thing. We did not know anything about the working class being accessories before the fact in every case where there is a strike, as we do now. (Applause.) The capitalist class are so interpreting the laws of this country now that they are convicting workmen for crimes everywhere in the United States for being accessories before the fact. Don't forget that. Now, then, in the interpretation of this word "Sabotage," as given by Delegate Gaylord from Wisconsin, this morning, he said that it meant a destruction of property. Comrades, I am surprised that the Boston delegation did not rise en masse, because they come from a city where the earlier patriots destroyed property in the American Revolution. (Applause.) In Boston, when the rebels threw the tea over in the harbor, that was Sabotage. We have a monument in Akron, Ohio, built to the memory of John Brown, who was also a rebel. Now, the capitalist class are interpreting the laws so that in every strike where there is any property destroyed, the working men who are out on strike may be indicted for being accessories before the fact and be jailed, when they had no part in destroying this property that was destroyed while they were on strike. If we adopt this clause, which as Delegate Gaylord interprets it means the destruction of property, are we, the Socialist party, going to expel from the party a workman convicted by the capitalist courts of destroying property? (Voices, "No.") Now, don't let us render any assistance to the capitalist class. They are convicting the workers everywhere of destruction of property. How can we determine whether the workmen destroyed the property or not? How can we? I am in favor of striking out this entire clause for this reason. I am heartily in favor of this part of Section I of Article II that we adopted with reference to political action. It says that all who subscribe to the principles of the Socialist party, including political action, shall be eligible to membership in the party. I have no sympathy with anybody that joins the party for the purpose of using the Socialist party to further the interests of some other organization. (Applause.) I do not care whether that other organization is the A. F. of L., the I. W.

W, or an independent organization of any kind. When we come into the Socialist party we fight the political battle. But the destruction of property will not take place by political socialists. As one comrade said, that will be done in the economic organizations. Now if the political organization is going to back up the working class on the economic field, we must back them up and we must not discriminate when the capitalist class says they have destroyed property somewhere, somehow. Let us stick to the working class. (Applause.)

DEL. DOBBS (Ky.): The comrade who has just preceded me has inadvertently given the strongest possible reason why you should leave this clause as reported by the committee, when she instances the case of the Boston Tea Party. Now, anyone who knows the significance of that event knows that it was an outburst on the part of John Hancock and a band of smugglers who used their own selfish interests to accomplish their purposes. (Applause.) Here is just the point: if you fall to include in the Constitution this clause as reported, you are going to furnish the basis for "provoking agents." It means that if you strike out the clause, or if you do not leave this clause in there, it means that the capitalist agents in the organizations will start expeditions of sabotage and make the working class responsible. (Applause.) There is the point. There may be exhibitions of violence as the comrade from Ohio has instanced, but they are the exceptions, and we cannot, in fairness to ourselves, base our actions on these exceptional outbursts which in the dim future may prove to be approvable. We, in this convention, represent, it seems to me, the high tide of Socialism. Heretofore we have been in something of a chaos. Now we have come to a position where we are a force in civilization, and if the socialist movement is to realize all that is best in it, it must now and here irrevocably put the stamp of its disapproval upon any anti-social, anti-constructive proceeding. (Applause.) We have got not only to allow the old members of this party, who have been fighting in it from the beginning, to go back to our respective constituencies with a declaration such as this in the Constitution, but we have a larger and wider duty. The working class is entitled to the best that there is in our civilization, and I protest against this attitude upon the part of some members of this party that, because there are not more good things in capitalism and civilization as it exists, therefore, we should repudiate capitalism and civilization and all its work. The working class is entitled to the best, and if the capitalist class desires to stain its hands with fraud and to practice violence, let us, who represent a new and constructive force, take our stand in favor of order as against chaos. (Applause.)

DEL. BENTALL: I am speaking against this section because of the discussion that has arisen. Not because I am in favor of violence, or in favor of any crime against any person; but I am against putting the Socialist party in a position where we have to put out something like this to the world, throwing a suspicion over us: the same as we did two years ago, or four years ago, when we told the world we were neutral on religion. We had no business telling the world that; they ought to have known that anyway. This year I understand that is not in the platform, and nowhere in our lit-

erature. We have learned a lesson. Why should we now go on record, doing the same fool thing over again.

The reason for all this is not because there are some Socialists who stand for violence, or because there is a tendency towards Sabotage in the Socialist party—not for a moment. There are some speakers who have not been on the square in this business. They are trying to throw dust in the face of the people, and in the face of the rank and file of the Socialist party. This is the kernel of the whole business. There is an element in the Socialist party today that is progressive and wants to go forward, wants to move and go ahead and use the best possible methods, so that we may gain something and there is another element that stands conservative, reactionary, monkeying with the old, outworn machinery. There is the division and you can talk for ten months, and that is the only thing, and not Sabotage or violence or anything of the kind. Now, come out and be square, every last one of you fellows. When I was on the board of the Chicago Daily Socialist, I fought against the horrible thing of violence, and mentioned a specific instance; when a little girl came down from her day's work and scabbled and in the corridor were two great big men. They knocked in three of her ribs; they crushed her jaw, and put her in the hospital for several months, and she is a cripple for life. I said, "I stand against that sort of thing," and every other member of the board of the Chicago Daily Socialist said: "Oh, you are foolish; go on and let them do it." Barney Berlyn, a member of the board himself, and Geo. Koop, one of them, and Mary O'Reilly.

DEL. KOOP: I deny it.

DEL. O'REILLY: I deny it.

DEL. BENTALL: I am not going behind the bush.

THE CHAIRMAN: Stick to the subject. DEL. BENTALL: This is the subject. In spite of the fact that I have stood for all the peaceful means without advocating the slightest violence, because I advocate this form of organization that says that violence may be absolutely unnecessary; because of that, they say that I am a direct actionist, and want violence. This is the reason that we have to come out squarely, and not come with things to throw dust in one another's eyes. So, as we have said before, we stand for political action, and that we stand for those things that make it possible for us to gain our purpose through our intelligence, through our ballot, through our organization, and not through bloodshed, and you don't need any of these things. A DELEGATE: Move to extend this time.

DEL. BENTALL: I don't need more time. I have done enough now to keep the other fellows quiet for a while.

DEL. O'REILLY (Ill.): I rise to a question of personal privilege. When I rise to a question of personal privilege on the attack that was made upon me, that was made upon the Daily Socialist Board of Directors and upon some of us named specifically and upon me especially, I won't be able to talk upon the question now before the house—so don't call me down for not talking to the question. However, I shall come as close to talking to the question as the last comrade from Illinois.

I say, as I always have said, not only must we stand against sabotage and violence in our platform and in our principles, but we must stand against it in our

tactics when we face the practical issues at the time of the strikes.

Now we had a personal controversy on the Board of Directors of the Daily Socialist in Chicago, with which controversy you have no business to be bothered at this time, and with which I would not bother you were it not for the personal attack which has been made upon me and which I must answer.

This is the first time Bentall has ever faced me with such a statement, such a charge, because he dare not face me with such an accusation in Chicago where everybody knows better, and knows that I was right in that controversy.

We had a strike in Chicago. Comrade Bentall blundered as editor of the Daily Socialist, not because he took one side or the other—he never takes sides—he blundered because he tried to be on both sides of the question, and because he knew nothing whatever of the issue.

THE CHAIRMAN: Speak to your question of personal privilege.

DEL. O'REILLY: Comrades, I have been attacked, and I would not care at all if it was merely an attack on me, but you are not going to attack the position of the Daily Socialist on the subject of labor unions; you are not going to attack the Board of Directors of the Daily Socialist; you are not going to misrepresent Mary O'Reilly without my talking back.

At the time of our strike, the Garment Workers' strike in Chicago I went to Bentall as a friend—I thought he was a friend of mine—and begged him not to stand for the labor leaders at the head of that strike. I knew they were crooked; I know it today. Robert Norine, President of the Garment Workers there in Chicago, and their National President were the type of leaders for which we could not stand. Bentall refused to take any information from the trade unionists who knew the situation. He went from meeting to meeting during that strike begging for votes for the Socialist party. You never saw such catering to trade unions in all your life as Comrade Bentall went through during that strike.

THE CHAIRMAN: Defend your own position.

DEL. O'REILLY: This is my position. He took an automobile and took in Robert Norine and the crooked officers of the Garment Workers' Union, and with them he went out vote begging, vote getting in the cheapest clap-trap kind of a way. He sent that bill for the automobile to the Executive Committee of the Socialist party and after a protest they paid that bill. Then he came out in an attack upon the people who had tried their very best to save those poor hungry garment worker girls from being defeated by that grafting crowd of trade unionists, and Comrade Bentall did this because he did not understand the situation. I answered him in the Daily Socialist and the Daily Socialist repudiated the position he had taken and withdrew him from his position on the editorial committee of the paper. That is the history of the Daily Socialist trouble that he bases his attack on. I have a copy of the article in my hand in which I review the whole thing and that was printed in the Daily Socialist. This is the first time Bentall ever had the nerve to face me and attempt to answer, and I think it will be his last.

DEL. KOOP (Ill.): I rise to a question of personal privilege. Bentall attacked me.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have passed that question now.

DEL. WHITE (Mass.): Koop was named directly by Bentall.

THE CHAIRMAN: If we are going to allow every person whose name is mentioned to rise to a question of personal privilege we may take up all of the time of the convention, which costs \$5 a minute, and we shall get no business done. We shall have a big bill to pay for these personalities. If the convention wants the Chair to allow all of this dirty linen to be washed in public, the Chair will let them wash it.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): It is not dirty linen. But it is my opinion that it is going out of the road of this convention.

DEL. KOOP: If the Chair had called Bentall down at the start this would not have happened.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair did call him down as soon as he got into personalities.

DEL. WHITE (Mass.): The other day a man who is not a delegate here permitted the same rights that Delegate Koop now asks for. I don't believe this is a washing of dirty linen. This had better be thrashed now than to be held in abeyance. It will have to be thrashed out some time. I think it is only fair and just that a comrade who has served in the ranks as many years as Koop should be given a hearing in this case. I move that Comrade Koop be granted a hearing on the question of personal privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will allow Comrade Koop the floor on the question of personal privilege.

DEL. KOOP (Ill.): I want to stand before you here and deny the statement made by Comrade Bentall that we stood for slugging a girl or anyone else. We have never advocated that. We have always opposed it. Just now we have the example in Chicago where men of wealth, the Lawsons, the Hearsts, who have the police department back of them, who have the thugs that they can buy with their money back of the police courts, hired to slug union printers, that are scabbing on the pressmen and stereotypers at the present time. I have seen this myself; and you can't do a thing. This rule as it is put forth by the committee should be adopted. The capitalist class have the power; they have the army, the militia, the police back of them who will put sabotage into use, not when the I. W. W. wants it, but when the capitalist class wants it. Adopt the report of the committee.

DEL. BREWER (Kan.): On the square, wouldn't it be a beautiful thing if we should split over a word that only 5 per cent of us know anything about. That is exactly what this word sabotage amounts to in this convention. If it is inserted, or if it is not inserted in this Constitution, the capitalist press will probably be compelled to notice it and give a definition of it in explanation. To my mind it is a word that is unnecessary in this document. It is quite evident that it is this word that is creating the friction, and I want to submit to Comrade Gaylord, the man who injected it here, that yesterday in the constitutional committee meeting he practically endorsed the ideas that we presented when we agreed to eliminate it from our report. My position as a Socialist is quite clear. I am sorry that there was not placed in our platform a declaration for industrial unionism, or the industrial form of organization; and yet I am not a direct actionist; I am not an anarchist; I am not in sympathy with many of the tactics of

the present I. W. W. But I have found myself confronted with this same trouble that so many other Socialists who have traveled over the country have found themselves confronted with. I realize that there is a disrupting element in the I. W. W. in the direct actionists; as there is a disrupting element even in the Socialist party. But I am convinced that if this document had been adopted, before this discussion which has terminated in personalities, the use of personal epithets, and going into personal histories with which this convention has no concern, I believe that every man and woman in this convention would have gone from here with a new-born hope in their hearts regarding the onrushing National Socialist movement. I believe that we would have had a keener feeling of fellowship, of comradeship for each other, than we can possibly have after this particular specific word, around which so much seems to hinge. Frankly, I want to say that those who have injected it into this report have simply raised hell. I feel that if this is voted down, and if it is adopted as it stands, it will answer all the purposes that it is intended to answer. If it is knocked out entirely I am satisfied that there will be a substitute that will cover the ground even better than the present one.

DEL BERGER (Wis.): Our Milwaukee movement is short on phrases, but long on action. Let us be perfectly sincere about this matter—perfectly sincere. The time has come when the two opposite trends of thought that we have had in our party must clash again. And the parting of the ways has come again.

There is no bridge between Socialism and Anarchism. There was no bridge when Karl Marx and Bakunin were fighting to a finish. There never can be any such bridge.

Those of you who stand for political action and for an effective and sane economic movement—who stand against the bomb, the dagger and every other form of violence—will know how to vote on this amendment without any further parley.

Comrades, the trouble with our party is that we have men in our councils who claim to be in favor of political action when they are not. We have a number of men who use our political organization—our Socialist party—as a cloak for what they call direct action, for I. W. W.-ism, sabotage and syndicalism. It is anarchism by a new name.

Now, Comrades, anarchy as such may be a beautiful philosophy. I don't blame anybody for proclaiming himself an anarchist; that is his privilege. But he ought not to foist himself upon the Socialist party.

I have known John Most personally. When nobody dared to preside in one of his meetings in Milwaukee in 1888 after the hanging of the anarchists in Chicago, and he asked me to take the chair, I did so. I told the audience that I did not agree with Most in anything, but that I believed in free speech. And I gave John Most credit that he did not try to fasten himself upon the Socialist party. He started a group of his own. Those who believe in the same principles as John Most did, should do as he did—leave the Socialist party and join the Anarchists. (Loud cheers.)

I desire to say that articles in the Industrial Worker, of Spokane, the official organ of the I. W. W. breathe the same

spirit, are as anarchistic as anything that John Most has ever written.

I want to say to you, comrades, that I for one do not believe in murder as a means of propaganda; I do not believe in theft as a means of expropriation; nor in a continuous riot as a free speech agitation.

Every true Socialist will agree with me when I say that those who believe that we should substitute "Hallelujah, I'm a bum," for the Marseillaise, and for the "International," should start a "Bum Organization" of their own. (Loud laughter and great cheering.)

Comrades, I have gone through a number of splits in this party. It was not always a fight against anarchism in the past. In the past we often had to fight Utopianism and fanaticism. Now it is anarchism again that is eating away at the vitals of our party.

If there is to be a parting of the ways, if there is to be a split—and it seems that you will have it, and must have it—then, I am ready to split right here. I am ready to go back to Milwaukee and appeal to the Socialists all over the country to cut this cancer out of our organization.

The objection that the word "sabotage" is not known is a subterfuge. We all understand it. It is a French word, meaning—willful destruction of products, of machinery or means of production. You know the French have also given us the word Socialism, but they were also the first to use the word Anarchism.

You know where Anarchism leads to. You know where it led in 1886 in our country. It led to the Hay Market riots and to the gallows. In France in 1894 the anarchist Ravachol headed a band of highwaymen and robbers in the name of the proletariat and expropriation for the benefit of his gang. You know what anarchism has accomplished this year in London and in Paris. It made individual brigandage possible under the cloak of an idea. I am not willing that our party should stand godfather for any business of that kind.

Some of the comrades over there said, that sabotage is a matter for the industrial organization to take up or not to take up. They contend that some members may have to commit it because their economic organization—their union wants them to. My answer is that any Socialist who is willing to commit such insane acts for his industrial organization, should quit our party. I would rather have such a man belong to the Militia of Christ, like the McNamaras. I would prefer that a man committing murder or theft should have a membership card of the Knights of Columbus than show the "red card." My time is up I see.

A NUMBER OF DELEGATES: Move that the time be extended.

DEL BERGER: I don't need any more time. I hope this convention will overwhelmingly vote for the insertion of the word "sabotage" in this section. I want to put it up to every delegate to take a stand for either one side or the other.

DEL HOGAN (Ark.): Leaving out this word was a most egregious mistake. Ever since this discussion arose I have been studying in my own mind what would be the best thing for the Socialist party to do. But about forty minutes ago I came to the conclusion, and I will give you the reasons why I have made up my mind that the best thing to do is to strike out the whole clause.

In the first place the Socialist Party has never declared for violence. It has never been a party of violence. It has never been accused of any such thing by those who were acquainted with its history. There is no reason why we should blazon forth to the world that we stand against a thing when there was never a suspicion among ourselves or among those who knew us that we stood for it. It would be equally ridiculous as it would be for Job Harriman's wife from the glorious State of California to place upon his back a placard reading "My husband has solemnly pledged me that he will not get drunk during the National convention." If we should read such a sign on Harriman's coat the suspicion would immediately arise that he was in the habit of getting drunk, every time he went away from home. Now if we are going to put the whole moral code in the constitution then I ask you to be equally consistent and put in a specific declaration against larceny, put in a specific declaration against polygamy, put in a specific declaration against free love. We have never stood for larceny; we have never stood for polygamy; we have never stood for free love. We have never stood for what some of our friends are pleased to call direct action. This is a political party, and this assertion has no place in our constitution. Who ever heard of political sabotage? It is absolutely ridiculous. My friend Hayes of Ohio made a splendid speech in favor of striking out this whole section, although he didn't seem to realize it. He stood here speaking for the autonomy of the trades unions and the labor unions, beginning this convention that we would not interfere with their business. Yet this constitutional committee comes here and proposes to tell the trade unions what they should do and what they should not do. I am of the opinion it is none of our business.

A DELEGATE: Read it again.

DEL HOGAN: I have read it and I can understand English. Now don't be alarmed about this threat of my big-hearted friend Berger, that he is going to split. That is a periodical threat of Berger's at every convention. Every time something doesn't go to suit Comrade Berger he goes up in the air and threatens to split. There is no danger of Berger splitting. He is loyal to the American Socialist movement and so are we. There is no need here for acrimonious discussion. There was no need for Berger or any other speaker who got on this floor to state that this was an effort to curb an anarchistic element. I believe this is a united party. I believe it stands for political action. I believe it stands for all that is best in the working class. We don't have to be labeled by a clause in the constitution. We don't need to tell people that we stand for law and order.

DEL SLAYTON (Pa.): Those who insist that we do not understand the meaning of this word and therefore we ought to take out the planks; those who insist that by leaving it in we will negatively accuse ourselves of having stood for those things previously and that we are now endeavoring to get out of it by an apology, entirely overlook the facts involved. If they don't understand the meaning of this word I am able to quote for their benefit from a man whom I believe they will accept as second, if not first, in the organization that is alleged to practice these things. At least he advocates them and that ought to make it plain to you that those who use the word have an idea what the word means. Let us see if I can de-

fine it. Direct action means exactly what it says. A mechanic knows that in order to get the best results the more directly you apply your power the more successful you will be. Direct action means that the workers shall be so organized that they can act directly for themselves in the place where they are employed without having to depend upon any one else. Sabotage as it prevails today means interfering with the machinery of production, without going on strike. It means to strike but stay on the pay roll. It means that instead of leaving the machine the workers will stay at the machine and turn out poor work, slow down their work, and in every other way that may be practicable interfere with the profits of the boss, and interfere to such an extent that the boss will have to come around and ask, what is wrong; what can I do to satisfy you people. That is a line of action that is not new, although the term may be new in this country. Vincent St. John in a speech in a Pittsburgh theater on the 27th of last month—

DEL HICKEY (Tex.): Does he belong to the Socialist party?

DEL SLAYTON: I don't know whether he does or not, but I agree with the definition of the word as he gave it. I am not dealing in personalities. Comrade Hogan says that we have not been accused of these things. Comrade Hogan ought to have the capitalist papers on his exchange list, for nearly all of them try to insist on that very thing and the hired man of a certain religious organization did insist that it was the philosophy of Socialism, the doctrines preached by the Socialist party that were responsible for the acts of the McNamaras. I know that the Socialist party has been accused of these things for years. We are told that the Socialist party ought not to dictate to the labor unions what they should do. We had a love feast yesterday in the debate on the party policy toward the unions, because it gave to those who have been asking us to endorse the substance of their form of organization a general statement with which they could agree. But now today when we say if we stand for you on the industrial field, if we back you up in your struggles regardless of the particular organizations to which you belong, we want you to say that you stand for certain things that we stand for. Then we are told that we are dictating. Suppose you want me to be a foster father to a child but you tell me that I must not tell the child what to do. You want us to go to their assistance in time of trouble but when we say here are certain things which we want you to endorse we are told that we are dictating. When it goes your way you want us to endorse your actions, but when we want you to go our way you say we are dictating. The fact is that these things have been done in the industrial field, and the fact is that some men who advocate doing them come on our platform after we have billed the meeting and have hired the hall, and tell the people that they do not believe in political Socialism. We political Socialists have the right to tell the world some of the things that we don't stand for, some of the things that I don't stand for, the things that you don't stand for, and among the things that we don't stand for is that a worker shall be foolish enough to destroy things. The other day a comrade said "Oh, what profound love you have for capitalist property." Well, I have profound love for the property that the working class has produced and that the capitalist system have stolen from them; I have profound love for

that property because we want to get it back for the working class. But you can't get it back if you destroy it. You will have nothing to get back. I have profound love for the property produced by the working class. It is a splendid thing. It represents the crystallization of the world's great labor power, the crystallization of our civilization. I have respect for it. I have respect for the men whose lives have been crystallized in those machines. I don't want men who have put their very life into those machines to destroy them. If I was in Russia I would be for sabotage. I would be for it there because there is no other way to carry on the fight. My sympathies are engaged by the struggle in Russia, but when those people come to this country I for one shall do all in my power to keep the working class as far away from the things involved in this sort of strife as possible.

DEL. BESSEMER (Ohio): I am very sorry that it has become necessary for this convention that yesterday held such a beautiful love feast to get into such a state as we are in now. Yesterday some men in this convention were telling you how they agreed with every other man in the convention; that the impossible had happened; that men who had fought each other for twenty years had shaken hands and we were to have harmony forever. Today they are going on the platform and charging that a lot of us are anarchists. Now I want to divide my remarks into two parts. First, I want to speak on the advisability of putting a clause of this kind in the constitution at all. But if we are going to put a clause in the constitution saying that we don't stand for something that no one has ever said the Socialist party did stand for, why for Heaven's sake let us put everything in the constitution that the capitalist class has ever charged us with, let us say that we don't intend to break up the home; that we don't intend to destroy incentive; that we don't believe in free love; that we would not destroy the institution of marriage, and a whole lot of other fool things that they say we advocate. If we are going to defend one point let us defend them all. Nobody has ever said that the Socialist party believed in sabotage.

A NUMBER OF DELEGATES: Oh, yes, they have.

DEL. BESSEMER: We are a political party trying to lay down a working program for the labor movement, and a great many of the speakers who have been on the platform this afternoon have taken a slam at the I. W. W. I want to say that I belong to the Retail Clerks Protective Association one of the A. F. of L. organizations. I don't belong to the I. W. W. When I stand here and take exception to the remarks made by some of you people I am not doing it as a member of that organization. You would think that every bit of violence ever committed in the United States in working class struggles have been done by the I. W. W.; you would imagine that the McNamars were I. W. W. men. They were not I. W. W. men. It is unfair and it is not a pertinent question here today. It is simply a question before the convention as to whether we shall interfere with a matter that belongs to the labor organizations. I maintain that we have not. We should throw out the entire thing.

I want to say in regard to this word, if what Comrade Haywood said is right and his idea is correct, that sabotage means destroying property. If that is so, Comrade Gaylord when he went out and appealed

for votes to be elected to the Legislature of Wisconsin meant to go down there and interfere with the established views on property that the capitalist class had embodied in the legislation of Wisconsin, then he was guilty of sabotage. It would seem that some of you in this convention think it is the duty of the working class to permit the capitalist class to interfere with your property, that is your stomach, to reduce the part of the product of your labor that you get so much that you suffer, and that in place of going back at them and protecting yourselves you should just calmly and suavely submit to it and let them grind you down without using any opportunity that you have at your hands to defend your property which is your stomach. I believe in political action first, last and all the time. I believe that political action is direct action.

DEL. KRAFT (N. J.): I wish to inquire whether the International Congress declared against sabotage or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know anything about it.

DEL. O'NEAL (Ind.): We are not here to defend ourselves against anything that has been charged by capitalist politicians or the capitalist press. The question is whether anything has arisen in the labor movement involving an endorsement of acts that come under the designation of sabotage or syndicalism; and whether we shall take a stand upon those tactics to the extent of repudiating them. It has been said that no one knows what sabotage and syndicalism means. It seems to me that those of us who have read anything of the development of the Socialist movement in France, where those methods have had their classic development, where the theoretical considerations that support them have been analyzed and developed will get this one fact which is fundamental for Socialists that every last one of the writers who have formulated the theoretical basis and defense of sabotage and syndicalism, to the very last man, is an avowed anarchist; is an anarchist, and opposed to all political action.

Another significant fact is that Jules Guesde, the foremost representative of the Marxian wing in the French Socialist movement has been the one man who first, last and all the time has been identified with the opposition to sabotage and syndicalism in general. Furthermore, the tactics supported by the Frenchmen who are the foremost representatives of these principles are directly connected with the anarchist ideal of society, a future that has absolutely no relation to the economic development of our time. It is a historical fact that a number of the men who developed criminal careers—Comrade Berger has mentioned one, Ravachol, who had been guilty of two brutal murders in the Southern part of France, coming up to Paris in the early 90's, when anarchist terrorism was at its height, when bomb throwing was of frequent occurrence—Ravachol, in the name of the revolution, in the name of sabotage, in the name of direct action, became a party to the development of those tactics, became associated with men who were in favor of them, and the whole thing was exposed when they finally indicted Ravachol for those murders, and he was finally executed for them.

Now to take up another phase of it, those of you who have read the best work ever produced in the international movement regarding the antagonism between anarchism and socialism, that written by our Russian comrade, Plechanoff, know that he draws a contrast between the tac-

tics of the Socialist party and the anarchists, and he points out the fact that in the development of tactics which lead to violence it is difficult to determine where the direct actionist ends and the bandit begins. That is what we have got to settle here this afternoon. We are a political organization. The adoption of this clause does not say to the labor organizations of this country, you shall do this, that or the other thing. It simply says that if a man makes application to the Socialist party of America for membership that in making that application he shall declare that he is not in favor of these tactics in any sort of an organization. If he advocates these tactics then we simply will not admit him to membership in the Socialist party.

DEL. CLIFFORD (Ohio): First I want to insist that the Socialist party is a political party organized expressly to carry out a certain program with an ultimate object in view, viz., the establishment of a new order of society. I contend that in no instance has the Socialist party been or ever will be an organization for the suppression of crime. That is the duty of the present order of society and its constituted officials.

Now, I want to throw a little light in on this. I want to go back to yesterday. I want to remind the members of the committee, of which I was a member, the committee on the Relationship of the Socialist party to the Trades Union movement, that when we met as a unit to report back to this body, we agreed to eliminate other matters that we expected to report; in other words, when we agreed upon our report there was only one thing in the hands of the majority, a resolution practically of the same import as incorporated in that resolution there, and we of the minority objected to it, and we prepared a counter-resolution, defending our class against the aspersions cast upon it. Now, we dropped these things yesterday for the sake of peace and harmony, and today some one has injected that section into this Constitution for a purpose. Now, I have got something here that perhaps is going to astonish a few members of this Convention. I have a matter of record here. Comrade Berger has a record in this Magazine, "The Common Cause." I am going to show you, and I will give Comrade Berger an opportunity to deny that he wrote this paragraph. I am reading this for the express purpose of showing you that even intellectual socialists cannot at times refrain from giving their allegiance, their sympathy, to the working class even when they are going to commit actual violence: "In view of the plutocratic law-making of the present day, it is easy to predict that the safety and hope of this country will finally lie in one direction only—that of a violent and bloody revolution, therefore I say that each of the 500,000 socialist voters and of the 2,000,000 workmen who instinctively incline our way, should, besides doing much reading and still more thinking, also have a good rifle and the necessary rounds of ammunition in his home." Now, let me repeat this: "Therefore, I say, each of the 500,000 Socialist voters, and of the 2,000,000 workmen who instinctively incline our way, should, besides doing much reading and still more thinking, also have a good rifle and the necessary rounds of ammunition in his home, and be prepared to back up his ballot with his bullets, if necessary."

Now, I am not accusing Comrade Berger of inciting "sabotage." I know he is in sympathy with the struggles of his class.

I know I have said rash things myself under provocation. I am one of those who, while I deplore violence, knowing its disastrous consequences in the outcome, yet if my class does commit violence, I am with them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up. The previous question was called for.

Del. Berger rose to a question of personal privilege.

Cries of "Berger," from all over the house.

Motion for the previous question was put, and declared lost.

Division was called for and the previous question carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Berger rises on a question of personal privilege. The previous question has been called for. On division, there is an absolute majority in favor of the previous question being put, —159 in favor. Before the previous question is put I will allow Comrade Berger the floor, on a question of personal privilege.

DEL. BERGER: Comrades, what I want to explain is, that the Socialist movement is undoubtedly revolutionary; that the Milwaukee movement is also revolutionary, of course, and that if it ever comes down to do real fighting, we will be there without question. But we do not mistake a riot for a revolution, nor murder for propaganda. We do not suggest theft as a means of expropriation. We do not preach the revolution in that way.

I also want to state that my article has not been quoted as a whole. The comrade over there, I believe it was Comrade Clifford just tore out a piece. I believe that is unfair to ourselves.

DEL. CLIFFORD: I will show you the whole editorial clipped out of your own paper.

DEL. BERGER: Well, Tom, you didn't read it. That editorial is good reading. (Laughter.) But this is not a time to read my editorials. This is the time to draw the line between a real Socialist revolution on one side and anarchy, murder and sabotage, on the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: I recognize Del. Harriman to speak for the insertion of the word sabotage.

DEL. HARRIMAN: In reply to Clifford, it is true there were other resolutions before the committee when we made our report yesterday, and we postponed those resolutions until the committee should meet. That committee has not yet had a session, and the resolutions are, therefore, in the air. In the meantime, the question arose. When I opened the argument yesterday, I said we had had many weary hours over the discussion of our differences, and that the excitement prevailing just before I took the platform was the evidence of a fundamental difference here. There is a difference here. Don't you think it is sugar-coated over in the words of that resolution. What we did yesterday in that resolution was to gobble up industrial unionism with the variations as they are provided in the labor movement of today. There is industrial unionism and industrial unionism. There is a difference between them. What we did, I want to call your attention to it, men, and to call it plainly, there is a reason for this difference. I told you yesterday. I repeat it: it is caused by the separation of the two great movements of America. They are weak; and the weakness begets a hopelessness, and the hopelessness begets the fight. There you are. Every blessed man who doesn't want this "sabotage" in our plat-

form or in our constitution, comes in—not every one of them but many of them—comes into our party and teaches it on the platform.

Now, listen, boys. You cannot find a trades union Constitution in America that puts it in there. Why? They don't dare to put their sabotage in, but you propagate it upon our platform, you commit the great Socialist party to it, and we must defend ourselves against it, because, between the two movements, is being born today the Syndicalist movement. I tell you the heart and the soul and the blood of the Syndicalist movement is sabotage. There isn't a man that believes in it that dares to stand up and say I did it. Of course not. I know what the conditions are; I know that the men oftentimes have to fight for their lives, and when the struggle is on there is no telling what will be done, but we must say, we cannot teach it, nor countenance it. If you do, and you permit it to absorb you, it will dissolve you and destroy you. Just look at it for a moment, look at what you are up against. On top of it comes the detective, back of it the police, back of it the judge to construe the law; all the evidence would be against us. You are expecting us to stand for a thing that not only will dissolve us, but that will put all the weapons in the hands of the other man. Why is it, men, that the great German movement has practically no syndicalism? Why is it? One of my friends here last night laughed and said it was because they were of the Teutonic race, and the other fellow was of the Italian race? Partly yes, but not all. Whenever you are separated, whenever you are weak, any weapon is a weapon of the man in despair, and this is the weapon of the boys that have lost hope in political action and are losing hope. The evidence is, that they stand here between us striking at political action, as they cheered yesterday when I made the statement against striking it out. They have lost their hope and the birth of Syndicalism is right here in our convention if we do not understand the facts.

THE CHAIRMAN: I recognize Delegate Hickey who will speak on the motion to strike out the whole paragraph.

DEL. HICKEY (Tex.): There is a feeling through the convention at this moment that I, Clifford, and Tom Lewis are bad bridge builders, and the logic and philosophy that kept Harriman and myself apart for twenty years seems to be still working through its usual channels.

Yesterday after leaving this platform I said that Indianapolis will be historic in this, that it had two unity conventions, and I still hope that this is going to be a second unity convention. The impossible happened yesterday; we had come together, and Gaylord of Wisconsin, said that there was very smooth work. Well, I didn't find any smoothness. I didn't write a line; I didn't dictate a paragraph, not even a semi-colon. All came from the other side that has injected this thing now. Why? Well, if we had nominated our candidate for the presidency at 3 o'clock this thing would not have happened at all. Peanut politics, that is what it is of course. Now, then, I don't know, I cannot understand the spirit that underlies that resolution, that section. I cannot understand it. I have had, with the other two Toms, to fight it from the start, and I will show you why. It was practically proposed the other night at a quarter to 12, that we should repudiate violence and advise the working class to

that end. I picked up the resolution and I said: "Why don't you advise the capitalist class not to use violence?" Sabotage—who can define it; why, they are not even able to pronounce it, with the Milwaukee accent. Sabotage; there are fifty-seven different varieties of pronunciations from the intellectual variety that says "sabotage" right down to the Irish pronunciation that says "sabbatage." The fact is that sabotage is in the air and sometimes it is down on the ground very strong, and we have nothing to do with it. We are a political party, and in the course of our development we come to have men of the times upon labor committees, upon constitutional committees that have earned the right to sit upon them by belonging to organized labor, and then they will not produce the anaemic things that the intellectuals have produced this afternoon.

However, and this is not from "The Common Cause," "In view of the plutocratic law making of the present day it is easy to predict that the safety and hope of this country will finally lie in one direction only, that of a violent and bloody revolution."

(Signed) "Victor L. Berger."
This is from the Social Democratic Herald.

I object to the introduction of this entire section. I object to anything that says, we warn the working class against anything. It is the working class, the class that has patiently carried the cross through the centuries. I say, you had better cut it all out and destroy that paragraph. I make the suggestion that Bill Haywood say a word or two.

DEL. HILLQUIT: In behalf of the committee, I wish to state that with the exception of Comrade Brewer who spoke on the subject and expressed his own beliefs, the committee unanimously accepts the amendment to insert the word "sabotage" instead of the words "against the person." The committee is opposed to the amendment to strike out the entire clause. I will tell you why in a minute. Before we proceed to that, however, I want to state that the committee is not wantonly injecting this subject. The section under consideration is an enlargement of the section we have had in the constitution now in force. We have had the provision that a member who opposes political action shall be expelled from the party. We have added the definition of political action. We have added the provision against advocating crime, or, as it will now be, "sabotage," or other methods of violence. Del. Brewer raised a point of order that Del. Hillquit was now speaking for the report of the Committee, and Del. Harriman had already done so.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I had a distinct understanding with the Chairman that I would have the closing word in support of this paragraph, and have therefore refrained from trying to get the floor in the meantime.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chairman of the Committee is correct in his statement, with this exception: he did not inform the chairman of the meeting that the Committee had accepted the word "sabotage." Had that been the case, Comrade Hillquit should have had the floor in the first instance in place of Comrade Harriman. I rule that the point of order made by Comrade Brewer is well taken.

DEL. HILLQUIT: From which I duly appeal.

THE CHAIRMAN: An appeal is taken from the decision of the Chair. The Chair rules that inasmuch as the committee has

accepted the amendment using the word "sabotage" as a part of its original motion, and inasmuch as Harriman has already spoken on that side of the question, the chairman of the committee has no right to discuss that side of the question at this time.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Which side of the question?

THE CHAIRMAN: What you are doing. The committee's position has already been stated.

DEL. HILLQUIT: In support of my appeal I will say that I do not know of any procedure by which the Chairman can place a delegate, not a member of the committee, to state the position of the committee. I do not know of anything stated by the Chairman which would show that by any act or assent I had waived the right of the committee to be heard last on the subject. On the contrary, it is admitted that we had a specific agreement that I should have the last word on the subject; and I claim, Comrades, since there have been so many insinuations against the action of the committee in submitting that report to you, it is no more than fair that you should hear from the committee on the modification and on the meaning of this clause.

The appeal was sustained and the decision of the Chair reversed.

A DELEGATE: Now that Comrade Hillquit is speaking on this section as amended, will one delegate who is in favor of the report as it originally stood, be allowed to speak on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: No; the action of the committee in accepting Garver's amendment takes the original paragraph out of the discussion of the convention.

DEL. HILLQUIT: It is important that we get to understand each other before we take a vote.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that an attempt has been made here to interpret the language before you as applying only to the Socialist party platform, in other words, several delegates have stated that all those who favor or advocate crime, sabotage, or other methods of violence as a weapon in the working class struggle, may advocate this method in union meetings, but not on a Socialist party platform. I want it to go on record that there is no such understanding of the committee which drafted this clause, as far as I know. It prohibits the advocacy of crime or sabotage or violence as a method of working class struggle, under any and all circumstances, and everywhere. We cannot be Socialists within the Socialist party and anarchists on other occasions. I wish you to understand that, while you vote on it. There has been an assertion here that in adopting or approving this clause, we attempt to dictate to the working class or to the labor movement, the use of its methods or weapons. We do not. We are dealing here with members of our own party and with no one else. We merely attempt to lay down a rule as to who shall be qualified to hold membership in this political organization of ours. We do not attempt to prescribe anything to labor unions.

Some comrades also claim that the mere mention of sabotage, violence and crime would lead to the imputation that the Socialist members may be advocating that. That is why they want it stricken

out. How about the paragraph we have just adopted, prohibiting distinction of race, color, creed, etc. Why didn't they raise an objection then? Why didn't they move to strike that out for fear it might otherwise be supposed that the Socialists have race or class or religious prejudices?

I will state furthermore, comrades, of the labor unions; let us be frank with each other on the subject. If there had not been any Socialists advocating these measures we would not be discussing it here now. Is it a pure accident that all these comrades who think the word "sabotage" irrelevant, happen to be the same who may perhaps be suspected of a fondness for these matters? I know personally of instances where prominent members of the party on public platforms did advocate just these things. Everyone of you knows. Why hide from it? I fear that our self-styled revolutionary comrades haven't always got the courage of their convictions. Why, comrades, if this is so absolutely improper for a Socialist constitution, why don't you simply vote against it? Why do you want to strike out the section entirely? Why don't you put it to the test? Why don't you stand up for it?

Now, comrades I will say this: This is an exceedingly serious matter and should not be straddled. Vote it up or vote it down, but express yourselves on it. It has taken this movement about thirty-five years to come to the point where we are beginning at last to see the fruit of a generation's work, and I say, if there is one thing in this country that can now check or disrupt the Socialist movement, it is not the capitalist class, it is not the Catholic Church; it is our own injudicious friends from within.

Del. Cumble of Oklahoma moved that the vote be taken by roll call. Carried.

On motion of Del. Bruce of Pennsylvania, the delegates in the corridor were notified that there was to be a vote by roll call.

DEL. CAREY (Mass.): Three of the Massachusetts delegates are compelled to leave in fifteen minutes, and we would like to be recorded.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that in the calling of the roll, the call will be made by states and the spokesman of each state will record the vote.

The decision of the Chair was appealed from, and reversed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is to strike out the whole paragraph, Section 6 of Article II; that is the question before the house. The vote yes, strikes it out. To vote no, does not strike it out; it retains it.

DEL. ENDRES (N. Y.): If we vote no, not to strike out, does that mean that the word "sabotage" is stricken out?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will make this ruling: The vote is on the committee's recommendation which includes the word "sabotage." The substitute motion is to strike out the whole section. You either strike it out or you do not strike it out.

DEL. BARNES (Pa.): Is it the understanding of the Chair that this vote will be succeeded by another vote on the adoption of the committee's report? We want to know whether there will be an opportunity to vote for the adoption of the report as originally presented.

THE CHAIRMAN: Except later by agreement? No.

The roll call was then taken and resulted as follows:

Ala.	Yes.	No.
Ariz.	Erma H. Allen	G. L. Cox
Ark.	Ida Callery	E. Johnson
Cal.	Dan Hogan	J. A. C. Meng
		A. E. Briggs
		E. A. Cantrell
		G. W. Downing
		Mary E. Garbutt
		Job Harriman
		E. H. Mizner
		R. A. Maynard
		A. W. Harris
		E. L. Reguin
		N. A. Richardson
		H. C. Tuck
		J. W. Wells
		F. C. Wheeler
		Ethel Whitehead
		T. W. Williams
		J. Stitt Wilson
		Frank E. Wolfe
		H. C. Wright
		W. E. Collins
		A. H. Floates
		Mary L. Geffs
		Thos. M. Todd
		John Troxell
		S. E. Beardsley
		E. Berger
		E. P. Clarke
		Chas. T. Peach
		Jasper McLevy
		F. A. Houck
		W. J. Ghent
		J. S. Alexander
		C. C. Allen
		Thos. Coonrod
		S. W. Motley
		I. F. Stewart
		B. Berlyn
		L. P. Haemer
		J. C. Kennedy
		M. E. Kirkpatrick
		Geo. Koop
		J. P. Larsen
		Caroline A. Lowe
		Mary O'Reilly
		W. E. Rodriguez
		Seymour Stedman
		G. N. Taylor
		Guy Underwood
		S. S. Condo
		W. W. Farmer
		Janet Fenimore
		S. C. Garrison
		W. H. Henry
		James Oneal
		S. M. Reynolds
		Wm. Sheffler
		Florence Wattles
		J. J. Jacobsen
		L. S. McCrillis
		May Wood-Simons
		Benj. F. Wilson
		Chas. Dobbs
		W. Lanfersiek
		Geo. A. England
		A. E. Hartig
		Dr. J. Rosett
		James F. Carey
		Alex. Coleman
		Chas. E. Fenner
		J. M. Caldwell
		Robert Lawrence
		Patrick Mahoney
		Rose Fenner
		G. E. Roewer, Jr.
		Dan A. White
		John Ohsol

Mich.	Yes	No.
	Jas. Illoogerhyde	Frank Aaltonen
	H. S. McMaster	Guy H. Lockwood
	Etta Menton	J. A. C. Menton
	J. H. McFarland	J. H. Grant
	Marletta F. Fournier	Nels S. Hillman
	Morris Kaplan	J. S. Ingalls
	J. G. Maatala	Olaus Jacobson
	A. O. Devold	T. E. Latimer
		David Morgan
		Jay E. Nash
		O. S. Watkins
		M. E. Fritz
		E. T. Behrens
		Wm. L. Garver
		Caleb Lipscomb
		Geo. W. O'Dam
		Otto Vierling
		W. A. Ward
		Fred J. Warren
		C. R. Oyler
		Clyde J. Wright
		Grant Miller
		John P. Burke
		Wm. A. McCall
		M. C. Jones
		George H. Goebel
		Harry F. Kopp
		Frederick Kraft
		James M. Reilly
		J. E. Lang
		C. J. Ball, Jr.
		Fred Bennetts
		Theresa Malkiel
		William Burckle
		Jas. A. Mansett
		Edward F. Cassidy
		Wm. E. Duffy
		Otto L. Endres
		C. L. Furman
		Morris Hillquit
		Algernon Lee
		Meyer London
		Herbert M. Merrill
		Clinton H. Pierce
		G. Rothmund
		Chas. E. Russell
		H. A. Simmons
		U. Solomon
		Gustave A. Strebel
		Joshua Wanhope
		A. E. Bowen, Jr.
		Robert Grant
		Chas. D. Kelso
		Arthur LeSueur
		Max S. Hayes
		F. G. Strickland
		J. L. Bachman
		M. J. Beery
		Wm. Bessemer
		Max Boehm
		T. Clifford
		D. Lewis Davis
		D. J. Farrell
		E. J. Jones
		W. Hinkle
		F. N. Prevey
		Dan McCarten
		Wm. Patterson
		Edgar E. Powell
		Marguerite Prevey
		Chas. M. Pricstap
		C. E. Ruthenberg
		Anna Storck
		Lawrence A. Zitt
		John G. Willis
		Ernest Schilling
		O. F. Branstetter
		Allen Fields
		J. T. Cumble
		R. E. Dooley
		L. B. Irvin
		Patrick S. Nagle

Yes.

Ore. M. E. Dorfman
John Hayden
Tom J. Lewis
Floyd C. Ramp
C. W. Sherman
L. R. Bruce
Gertrude B. Hunt
C. W. Ervin
F. H. Merrick
Edward Moore
William Parker
C. F. Foley
A. G. Ward
Robert J. Wheeler

No.
Geo. E. Owen
Oscar Ameringer
M. F. Parker

The motion was put and lost.

NOMINATIONS.

DEL. BARTH: I move that the convention suspend the rules and proceed to the nomination of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is that we proceed to nominate. It was moved to amend that the convention continue in session until the nominations have been completed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion now before the house is that we proceed to nominate candidates for President and Vice-President.

DEL. BARNES (Pa.): And that the roll of states be called and each state be given a chance to nominate.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the roll be called and each state be given an opportunity to make its nominations. The motion was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion as amended is before you, that we suspend the rules and proceed to the nominations of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States, that the roll of States be called and each state given an opportunity to name its candidate, and that the convention remain in session until the nominees shall have been selected.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): There are delegations that are divided.

(Cries of "Nominate them all.")

THE CHAIRMAN: When a state is called any delegate will have an opportunity to nominate a candidate. Any state not wishing to nominate or electing to give their time to some other state may do so.

The roll call for nominations for candidates for President of the United States was then had and resulted in the nomination of Eugene V. Debs, Emil Seidel and Charles Edward Russell.

A DELEGATE: It has been circulated in the hall that Gene Debs is in physical ill health. I want to know whether there is any truth in that report?

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): A point of order. The rule prohibits nominating speeches but does not prohibit, and on the contrary encourages the discussion of nominees and their respective merits and availability when the nominations are completed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nominating speeches will not be allowed.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): A point of order. If we can not make nominating speeches we can discuss the respective merits of the candidates.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): I have been assured by a dozen men that Debs is all right.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that no nominating speeches or discussions of the merits of candidates is in order under the rules of the convention.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: State the ground of the appeal.

(Cries of "roll call.")

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegates will be in order. We will hear the appeal.

DEL. HILLQUIT: You will not howl me down. I have taken an appeal from the Chair for this reason: A motion was made to cut out nominating speeches, and for a very good reason, because nominating speeches are in most instances of such a character as to turn the convention from a deliberative body into a howling

Yes.

Ore. M. E. Dorfman
John Hayden
Tom J. Lewis
Floyd C. Ramp
C. W. Sherman
L. R. Bruce
Gertrude B. Hunt
C. W. Ervin
F. H. Merrick
Edward Moore
William Parker
C. F. Foley
A. G. Ward
Robert J. Wheeler

No.
Geo. E. Owen
Oscar Ameringer
M. F. Parker

The motion was put and lost.

NOMINATIONS.

DEL. BARTH: I move that the convention suspend the rules and proceed to the nomination of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is that we proceed to nominate. It was moved to amend that the convention continue in session until the nominations have been completed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion now before the house is that we proceed to nominate candidates for President and Vice-President.

DEL. BARNES (Pa.): And that the roll of states be called and each state be given a chance to nominate.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the roll be called and each state be given an opportunity to make its nominations. The motion was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion as amended is before you, that we suspend the rules and proceed to the nominations of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States, that the roll of States be called and each state given an opportunity to name its candidate, and that the convention remain in session until the nominees shall have been selected.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): There are delegations that are divided.

(Cries of "Nominate them all.")

THE CHAIRMAN: When a state is called any delegate will have an opportunity to nominate a candidate. Any state not wishing to nominate or electing to give their time to some other state may do so.

The roll call for nominations for candidates for President of the United States was then had and resulted in the nomination of Eugene V. Debs, Emil Seidel and Charles Edward Russell.

A DELEGATE: It has been circulated in the hall that Gene Debs is in physical ill health. I want to know whether there is any truth in that report?

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): A point of order. The rule prohibits nominating speeches but does not prohibit, and on the contrary encourages the discussion of nominees and their respective merits and availability when the nominations are completed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nominating speeches will not be allowed.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): A point of order. If we can not make nominating speeches we can discuss the respective merits of the candidates.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): I have been assured by a dozen men that Debs is all right.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that no nominating speeches or discussions of the merits of candidates is in order under the rules of the convention.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: State the ground of the appeal.

(Cries of "roll call.")

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegates will be in order. We will hear the appeal.

DEL. HILLQUIT: You will not howl me down. I have taken an appeal from the Chair for this reason: A motion was made to cut out nominating speeches, and for a very good reason, because nominating speeches are in most instances of such a character as to turn the convention from a deliberative body into a howling

Yes.

Ore. M. E. Dorfman
John Hayden
Tom J. Lewis
Floyd C. Ramp
C. W. Sherman
L. R. Bruce
Gertrude B. Hunt
C. W. Ervin
F. H. Merrick
Edward Moore
William Parker
C. F. Foley
A. G. Ward
Robert J. Wheeler

No.
Geo. E. Owen
Oscar Ameringer
M. F. Parker

The motion was put and lost.

NOMINATIONS.

DEL. BARTH: I move that the convention suspend the rules and proceed to the nomination of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is that we proceed to nominate. It was moved to amend that the convention continue in session until the nominations have been completed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion now before the house is that we proceed to nominate candidates for President and Vice-President.

DEL. BARNES (Pa.): And that the roll of states be called and each state be given a chance to nominate.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the roll be called and each state be given an opportunity to make its nominations. The motion was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion as amended is before you, that we suspend the rules and proceed to the nominations of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States, that the roll of States be called and each state given an opportunity to name its candidate, and that the convention remain in session until the nominees shall have been selected.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): There are delegations that are divided.

(Cries of "Nominate them all.")

THE CHAIRMAN: When a state is called any delegate will have an opportunity to nominate a candidate. Any state not wishing to nominate or electing to give their time to some other state may do so.

The roll call for nominations for candidates for President of the United States was then had and resulted in the nomination of Eugene V. Debs, Emil Seidel and Charles Edward Russell.

A DELEGATE: It has been circulated in the hall that Gene Debs is in physical ill health. I want to know whether there is any truth in that report?

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): A point of order. The rule prohibits nominating speeches but does not prohibit, and on the contrary encourages the discussion of nominees and their respective merits and availability when the nominations are completed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nominating speeches will not be allowed.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): A point of order. If we can not make nominating speeches we can discuss the respective merits of the candidates.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): I have been assured by a dozen men that Debs is all right.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that no nominating speeches or discussions of the merits of candidates is in order under the rules of the convention.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: State the ground of the appeal.

(Cries of "roll call.")

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegates will be in order. We will hear the appeal.

DEL. HILLQUIT: You will not howl me down. I have taken an appeal from the Chair for this reason: A motion was made to cut out nominating speeches, and for a very good reason, because nominating speeches are in most instances of such a character as to turn the convention from a deliberative body into a howling

Yes.

Ore. M. E. Dorfman
John Hayden
Tom J. Lewis
Floyd C. Ramp
C. W. Sherman
L. R. Bruce
Gertrude B. Hunt
C. W. Ervin
F. H. Merrick
Edward Moore
William Parker
C. F. Foley
A. G. Ward
Robert J. Wheeler

No.
Geo. E. Owen
Oscar Ameringer
M. F. Parker

The motion was put and lost.

NOMINATIONS.

DEL. BARTH: I move that the convention suspend the rules and proceed to the nomination of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is that we proceed to nominate. It was moved to amend that the convention continue in session until the nominations have been completed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion now before the house is that we proceed to nominate candidates for President and Vice-President.

DEL. BARNES (Pa.): And that the roll of states be called and each state be given a chance to nominate.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the roll be called and each state be given an opportunity to make its nominations. The motion was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion as amended is before you, that we suspend the rules and proceed to the nominations of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States, that the roll of States be called and each state given an opportunity to name its candidate, and that the convention remain in session until the nominees shall have been selected.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): There are delegations that are divided.

(Cries of "Nominate them all.")

THE CHAIRMAN: When a state is called any delegate will have an opportunity to nominate a candidate. Any state not wishing to nominate or electing to give their time to some other state may do so.

The roll call for nominations for candidates for President of the United States was then had and resulted in the nomination of Eugene V. Debs, Emil Seidel and Charles Edward Russell.

A DELEGATE: It has been circulated in the hall that Gene Debs is in physical ill health. I want to know whether there is any truth in that report?

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): A point of order. The rule prohibits nominating speeches but does not prohibit, and on the contrary encourages the discussion of nominees and their respective merits and availability when the nominations are completed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nominating speeches will not be allowed.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): A point of order. If we can not make nominating speeches we can discuss the respective merits of the candidates.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): I have been assured by a dozen men that Debs is all right.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that no nominating speeches or discussions of the merits of candidates is in order under the rules of the convention.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: State the ground of the appeal.

(Cries of "roll call.")

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegates will be in order. We will hear the appeal.

DEL. HILLQUIT: You will not howl me down. I have taken an appeal from the Chair for this reason: A motion was made to cut out nominating speeches, and for a very good reason, because nominating speeches are in most instances of such a character as to turn the convention from a deliberative body into a howling

Yes.

Ore. M. E. Dorfman
John Hayden
Tom J. Lewis
Floyd C. Ramp
C. W. Sherman
L. R. Bruce
Gertrude B. Hunt
C. W. Ervin
F. H. Merrick
Edward Moore
William Parker
C. F. Foley
A. G. Ward
Robert J. Wheeler

No.
Geo. E. Owen
Oscar Ameringer
M. F. Parker

The motion was put and lost.

NOMINATIONS.

DEL. BARTH: I move that the convention suspend the rules and proceed to the nomination of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is that we proceed to nominate. It was moved to amend that the convention continue in session until the nominations have been completed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion now before the house is that we proceed to nominate candidates for President and Vice-President.

DEL. BARNES (Pa.): And that the roll of states be called and each state be given a chance to nominate.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the roll be called and each state be given an opportunity to make its nominations. The motion was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion as amended is before you, that we suspend the rules and proceed to the nominations of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States, that the roll of States be called and each state given an opportunity to name its candidate, and that the convention remain in session until the nominees shall have been selected.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): There are delegations that are divided.

(Cries of "Nominate them all.")

THE CHAIRMAN: When a state is called any delegate will have an opportunity to nominate a candidate. Any state not wishing to nominate or electing to give their time to some other state may do so.

The roll call for nominations for candidates for President of the United States was then had and resulted in the nomination of Eugene V. Debs, Emil Seidel and Charles Edward Russell.

A DELEGATE: It has been circulated in the hall that Gene Debs is in physical ill health. I want to know whether there is any truth in that report?</

mob. But I claim there is no word in the rule against the discussion of the merits of the candidates, and on the contrary if we want to carry out the spirit of the rule in not making nominating speeches which is that we want to be a deliberative, sensible body, then I claim that I have the right to discuss on the floor of the convention whether one or the other of the members whose names have been placed before us would be the best standard bearer for the Socialist party. I claim that I owe this to my constituents who have instructed me on this matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair stands simply on the rules of the convention and their interpretation in what he believes to have been the spirit of those rules.

ROLL CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR PRESIDENT.

	DEBS.	SEIDEL.	RUSSELL.
Alabama—	G. L. Cox		
Arizona—	E. H. Allen		
Arkansas—	E. Johnston		
	Ida Callery		
	Dan Hogan		
	J. A. C. Meng		
	A. R. Flanks		
California—	Edw. A. Cantrell	A. E. Briggs	Mary E. Garbutt
	H. C. Tuck	Geo. W. Downing	
	H. E. Wright	Job Harriman	
		E. H. Mizner	
		R. A. Maynard	
		A. W. Harris	
		Ernest L. Regula	
		N. A. Richardson	
		J. W. Wells	
		Fred C. Wheeler	
		Ethel Whitehead	
		Thos. W. Williams	
		J. Stitt Wilson	
		Frank E. Wolfe	
Colorado—	W. P. Collins		A. H. Floaten
	Mary L. Goffs		
	Thomas M. Todd		
	John Troxell		
Connecticut—		S. E. Beardsley	
		Ernest Berger	
		E. P. Clark	
		Chas. T. Peach	
		Jasper McLevy	
Georgia—		A. F. Castleberry	
Delaware—		Frank A. Houck	
D. of C.—		W. J. Ghent	
Florida—		C. C. Allen	
Idaho—	Fred Stanley		
	G. W. Beloit		
	Thos. J. Coonrod		
	Sidney W. Motley		
	Isaac F. Stewart		
Illinois—	J. O. Bentall	Jas. P. Larsen	Bernard Berlyn
	Joseph R. Burge	Mary O'Reilly	
	Louis F. Haemer	W. E. Rodriguez	
	John C. Sjoden		
	Caroline A. Lowe		
	J. C. Kennedy		
	M. E. Kirkpatrick		
	Geo. Koop		
	George North Taylor		
	F. T. Maxwell		
	Guy Underwood		
Indiana—	S. S. Condo		
	W. W. Farmer		
	Janet Fenimore		
	Stephen C. Garrison		
	Wm. H. Henry		
	James Oneal		
	S. M. Reynolds		
	William Sheffler		
	Florence Wattles		
Iowa—	Jas. Baxter	John J. Jacobsen	
	Lee W. Lang	Margaret D. Brown	
		Irving S. McCrillis	

The motion to sustain the Chair was carried.

It was then moved and seconded that the roll call be made of the individual delegates. The motion was carried.

A DELEGATE: How are we to know that Comrade Debs will accept?

DEL. BERGER: Before we vote we ought to know whether Comrade Debs will accept.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question has been asked whether there is any certainty whether Comrade Debs will accept the nomination. It is stated positively that he will by people who claim to know what they are talking about.

DEL. BERGER: Do they?

THE CHAIRMAN: They do.

The roll call on the vote upon the nominations was then had as follows:

	DEBS.	SEIDEL.	RUSSELL.
Kansas—	Oscar H. Blase Geo. D. Brewer A. W. Ricker May Wood-Simons S. M. Stallard Benj. F. Wilson Chas. Dobbs Walter Lanfersiek J. R. Jones		Geo. A. England Chas. B. Backman Dr. J. Rosett C. W. Staub Robt. Lawrence G. E. Roewer, Jr.
Kentucky—			
Louisiana—			
Maine—			
Maryland—			
Massachusetts—	Alex Coleman Chas. E. Fenner J. M. Caldwell Dan A. White Rose Fenner J. G. Ohsoi Frank Aaltonen Jas. Hoogerhyde Guy H. Lockwood H. S. McMaster Etta Menton J. A. C. Menton Jas. H. McFarland Marietta E. Fournier John H. Grant J. S. Ingalls Olaus Jacobson Morris Kaplan Thos. E. Latimer J. G. Maattala A. O. Devold O. S. Watkins M. E. Fritz	Nels S. Hillman David Morgan Jay F. Nash	
Michigan—			
Minnesota—			
Mississippi—			
Missouri—		E. T. Behrens Wm. L. Garver Caleb Lipscomb George W. O'Dam Otto Vierling W. A. Ward	Philip H. Christian
Montana—	Lewis J. Duncan Clarence A. Smith Jacob M. Kruse James B. Scott Fred J. Warren C. R. Oyler Clyde J. Wright Grant Miller		
Nebraska—			
Nevada—			
New Hampshire—	John P. Burke Wm. A. McCall		
New Jersey—	J. R. Jones Christopher J. Cosgrove George H. Goebel W. B. Killingbeck Harry F. Kopp James M. Reilly Gustave Theimer J. B. Lang E. Lindgren Albert Pauly	Frederick Kraft	
New Mexico—			
New York—			Henry Slobodin C. J. Ball, Jr. Fred Bennetts Theresa Malkdel Wm. Burckle Jas. A. Mansett Ed. F. Cassidy Wm. E. Duffy Otto L. Endres C. L. Furman Morris Hillquit Algernon Lee Meyer London H. M. Merrill C. H. Pierce G. Rothmund H. A. Simmons U. Solomon Gustave A. Strebel Joshua Wanhope Benjamin T. Tillier
North Carolina—			
North Dakota—	A. E. Bowen, Jr. Robert Grant Chas. D. Kelso Arthur LeSueur		

NATIONAL SOCIALIST CONVENTION

	DEBS.	SEIDEL.	RUSSELL.
Ohio—	Jacob L. Bachman M. J. Beery Wm. Bessemer Max Boehm T. Clifford D. J. Farrell Edw. J. Jones F. N. Prevey Dan McCortea Wm. Patterson E. E. Powell Marguerite Prevey C. M. Priestap C. E. Ruthenberg Anna K. Storck Lawrence A. Zitt	D. L. Davis M. S. Hayes F. G. Strickland	W. Hinkle
Oklahoma—	John G. Willis M. F. Barker	O. Ameringer Otto F. Branstetter R. E. Dooley Patrick S. Nagle Geo. E. Owen Allen Fields	J. T. Cumbie L. B. Irvin E. Schilling
Oregon—	Maurice E. Dorfman John Hayden Tom J. Lewis Floyd C. Ramp C. W. Sherman G. W. Bacon J. M. Barnes Cora Mae Bixler Leroy R. Bruce Anna Cohen Jos. E. Cohen Lewis Goaziou Richard L. Gralnger James C. Hogan Gertrude B. Hunt J. H. Maurer C. W. Irvin F. H. Merrick Edward Moore Wm. Parker C. F. Foley J. W. Slayton A. G. Ward R. J. Wheeler David Williams John C. Young James P. Reid E. W. Thelnert		
Pennsylvania—			Dan M. Caldwell Frank A. Davis Chas. H. Maurer L. B. Wilson, Jr. W. A. Prosser
Rhode Island—		Wm. Eberhard	B. Dempsey
South Carolina—			
South Dakota—			
Tennessee—	C. G. Harold Ed. A. Green T. A. Hickey E. R. Meltzen W. S. Noble J. C. Rhodes L. L. Rhodes M. A. Smith J. C. Thompson B. Williams	R. Alexander G. C. Edwards C. A. Byrd	
Texas—			
Utah—			H. P. Rurt J. A. Smith W. M. Wesley John Spargo
Vermont—			
Virginia—	G. M. Norris L. E. Aller A. H. Barth Frans Bostrom Emma D. Cory Kate Sadler Samuel Sadler Hulet M. Wells	E. J. Brown W. H. Waynick H. C. Cupples Henry Hensefer	
Washington—			
West Virginia—	C. H. Boswell H. W. Houston E. H. Kintzer		
Wisconsin—		Victor L. Berger Dan W. Hoan W. R. Gaylord W. A. Jacobs T. Minklein Elizabeth H. Thomas Carl D. Thompson	Emil Seidel
Wyoming—	Antony Carlson Paul J. Paulsen J. Surja		

The roll call showed the following results:

Eugene V. Debs, 165; Emil Seidel, 56; Charles Edward Russell, 54.

DEL. SEIDEL (Wis.): I wish to thank those that cast their votes for Seidel, as suggested by Wisconsin, for the confidence that they have placed in the Wisconsin spirit. On the other hand, in behalf of Mrs. Seidel, I wish to thank those who have voted against me, because Mrs. Seidel wished that I should not be nominated. I desire to make a motion at this time, which I believe will be seconded by Comrade Russell, that we make the nomination of Comrade Debs unanimous.

DEL. RUSSELL (N. Y.): I never had greater joy in my life than I have when I second that motion.

On the motion being put the nomination of Comrade Debs was made unanimous.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move that a despatch be sent to Comrade E. V. Debs notifying him on his nomination.

It was so ordered.

DEL. SPARGO: I move that we now proceed with the nomination for Vice-President in the same manner that we nominated for President.

The motion was carried.

The roll call on nominations for Vice-President and resulted in the nomination of Dan Hogan, J. W. Slayton and Emil Seidel.

DEL. RUSSELL (N. Y.): In order to save the time of this convention which has now grown somewhat valuable, let me say that for reasons which I can state but which I would prefer not to state, it will be impossible for me to accept this nomination, although I appreciate very much the kindness of those who have urged it upon you.

All of the nominees declined except Delegates Seidel, Slayton and Hogan.

The roll was then called for the selection of the vice-presidential candidate.

NOMINATIONS FOR VICE-PRESIDENT.

	HOGAN.	SLAYTON.	SEIDEL.
Alabama—			G. L. Cox
Arizona—			Erma Hyatt E. Johnson
Arkansas—	Ida Callery J. A. C. Meng A. R. Finks		
California—	Ernest L. Reguin		A. E. Briggs E. A. Cantrell G. W. Downing Mary E. Garbutt Job Harriman E. H. Mizner R. A. Maynard A. W. Harris N. A. Richardson H. C. Tuck J. W. Wells Fred C. Wheeler Ethel Whitehead T. W. Williams J. S. Wilson Frank E. Wolfe H. E. Wright W. P. Collins A. H. Floaten Mary L. Geffs Thos. M. Todd John Troxell Sam E. Beardsley Ernest Berger E. P. Clarke Chas. T. Peach Jasper McLevy Frank A. Houck W. J. Ghent
Colorado—			
Connecticut—			A. F. Castleberry T. J. Coonrod S. W. Motley Bernard Berlyn J. R. Burge J. C. Sjoden J. C. Kennedy M. E. Kirkpatrick George Koop James P. Larsen Caroline A. Lowe F. T. Maxwell Mary O'Reilly W. E. Rodriguez Seymour Stedman G. N. Taylor Guy Underwood Samuel Condo W. W. Farmer Janet Fenimore S. C. Garrison
Delaware—			
D. of C.—			
Florida—			
Georgia—		Fred Stanley	
Idaho—	G. W. Beloit I. F. Stewart J. O. Bentall		
Illinois—			
Indiana—			

	HOGAN.	SLAYTON.	SEIDEL.
Iowa—			Wm. H. Henry S. M. Reynolds Wm. Sheffler Florence Wattles Margaret D. Brown J. J. Jacobsen Lee W. Lang Irving S. McCrillis Benj. F. Wilson May Wood-Simons
Kansas—	Oscar H. Blase Geo. D. Brewer S. M. Stallard	A. W. Ricker	Chas. Dobbs J. R. Jones G. A. England Dr. J. Rosett
Kentucky—		A. R. Hartig C. W. Staub J. M. Caldwell	Alex. Coleman Robt. Lawrence G. E. Roewer, Jr. Dan A. White J. G. Ohsol
Louisiana—			
Maine—			
Maryland—			
Massachusetts—	Charles E. Fenner Rose Fenner		
Michigan—	Frank Aaltonen Jas. Hoogerhyde Guy H. Lockwood H. S. McMaster Elta Menton Jas. H. McFarland	J. A. C. Menton	
Minnesota—			M. F. Fournler J. H. Grant N. S. Hillman J. S. Ingalls Olaus Jacobson Morris Kaplan Thos. E. Latimer J. G. Maattala David Morgan Jay E. Nash A. O. Devold O. S. Watkins M. E. Fritz E. T. Behrens W. L. Garver C. Lipscomb G. W. O'Dam Otto Vierling W. A. Ward
Mississippi—			
Missouri—			
Montana—	Lewis J. Duncan Clarence A. Smith Jacob M. Kruse James B. Scott Philip H. Christian		F. J. Warren C. R. Oyler Grant Miller
Nebraska—			J. R. Jones H. F. Kopp F. Kraft J. M. Kelly Gustave Thelmer
Nevada—		W. A. McCall	
New Hampshire—	J. P. Burke		
New Jersey—	C. J. Cosgrove W. B. Killingbeck		
New Mexico—	Not Voting		
New York—	Henry Slobodin Theresa Malkiel E. Lindgren Albert Pauly	Fred Bennetts C. L. Furman Clinton H. Pierce G. Rothmund	Wm. Burckle Jas. A. Mansett E. F. Cassidy Wm. L. Duffy O. L. Endres Morris Hillquit Algernon Lee Meyer London H. M. Merrill C. E. Russell H. A. Simmons U. Solomon G. A. Strebel J. Wanhope B. T. Tiller A. E. Bowen, Jr. Robert Grant Chas. D. Kelso D. L. Davis M. S. Hayes W. Hinkle Marguerite Prevey
North Carolina—		Arthur LeSueur	
North Dakota—			
Ohio—	Jacob L. Bachman M. J. Beery Wm. Bessemer Max Boehm T. Clifford Dominick J. Farrell	F. G. Strickland	

	HOGAN.	SLAYTON.	SEIDEL.
Oklahoma—	E. J. Jones F. N. Prevey Wm. Patterson Chas. M. Priestap C. E. Ruthenberg Anna K. Storck Lawrence A. Zitt Dan McCartan		E. Schilling O. F. Branstetter S. T. Cumble R. E. Dooley L. E. Irvin P. S. Nagle G. E. Owen Oscar Ameringer M. F. Barker J. G. Willis M. E. Dorfman J. Hayden F. C. Ramp C. W. Sherman Cora M. Bixler J. E. Cohen R. L. Grainger Jas. H. Maurer J. W. Slayton David Williams L. B. Wilson, Jr. W. A. Prosser
Oregon—	Tom J. Lewis		
Pennsylvania—	Leroy R. Bruce James C. Hogan C. W. Ervin F. H. Merrick Wm. Parker A. G. Ward R. J. Wheeler	G. W. Bacon Dan M. Caldwell Frank A. Davis Lewis Goazlou Chas. A. Maurer R. B. Ringler John C. Young	Wm. Eberhard
Rhode Island—		James P. Reid E. W. Theinert	
So. Carolina—			
So. Dakota—	Benjamin Dempsey C. G. Harold E. A. Green T. A. Hickey E. R. Meltzen W. S. Noble J. C. Rhodes L. L. Rhodes M. A. Smith J. C. Thompson B. William Wm. M. Wesley		Richey Alexander G. C. Edwards C. A. Byrd
Tennessee—			
Texas—			
Utah—			
Vermont—			
Virginia—			
Washington—	Leslie E. Aller A. H. Barth Frans Boström Kate Sadler Samuel Sadler	Hulet M. Wells	John Spargo G. M. Norris E. J. Brown W. H. Wing Emma D. Cory H. C. Cupples Anna A. Maley Henry Henseler C. H. Boswell Dan W. Hoan W. R. Gaylord W. A. Jacobs Thos. Minklen Elizabeth H. Thomas C. D. Thompson Antony Carlson
West Va.—	H. W. Houston	E. H. Kintzer	
Wisconsin—	Emil Seidel		
Wyoming—	Paul J. Paulsen J. Suaja		

The result of the roll call was announced as follows: Emil Seidel, 159; Dan Hogan, 73; John W. Slayton, 24.

DEL. HOGAN: Appreciating the unexpected honor given me by the 73 comrades who voted for me for the second place on the ticket I move that the nomination of Emil Seidel be made unanimous.

DEL. SLAYTON: I need not repeat what Comrade Hogan has said. The honor to me is not quite so large in numbers, but then he is a larger man. I second the motion to make the nomination of Comrade Seidel unanimous.

The motion was unanimously carried.

A DELEGATE: I move that we adjourn and join the parade.

DEL. SPARGO: With all deference to the local comrades that have arranged this parade, I submit that parading the streets is less important to the party than doing

the business for which we have been called together. Most of us have arranged so that we must get through tomorrow night. Some of our most important committees have not yet reported. We have still the immigration matter and three-quarters of the Constitution to adopt. I move as an amendment that we adjourn until 9:30 o'clock tonight.

At this point there were cries for a speech from Comrade Seidel, who at the request of the Chairman took the platform.

DEL. SEIDEL: I do not intend to delay you for any length of time. But I want to make it clear to you that I shall do everything in my power to give the opposition, the capitalist parties, as warm a fight as they have ever had. From what I know of Comrade Debs I believe that he will be heart and soul with me in this. The little differences that we have had

on the floor of the convention only concern themselves with questions of tactics. Let me say that I believe that the Washington comrades as well as the California comrades and the comrades of Ohio, as well as those of Pennsylvania, New York and Wisconsin, all stand together for that one big thing, the final abolition of this wage slave system. We differ a little bit in the way of getting there. We of Wisconsin believe that we should try to do everything that we can to strengthen our class. Some of the other comrades, quite as sincere, believe that we dissipate our forces if we pay any attention to the immediate questions before us. But whatever our differences on that line let us see that the enemy get no comfort out of those differences. While I believe in fighting for the immediate things, as well as the ultimate goal let me say that I stand squarely on the platform. Every one of the Wisconsin comrades hopes and works, and those that pray, pray for the final and absolute dissolution of this wage system, for the day when we may see the manhood and womanhood made free to develop into a higher and better manhood and womanhood. We hope for that and we all work for that. When this convention is over let us go out and begin the fight. Let us show the enemy that there is the same spirit of liberty in our ranks; let them understand that they cannot yet have everything their own way; let them understand that the American working class is developing its intelligence, is growing in strength numerically and that the day is rapidly coming when that working class will get

control of all that it should control and get for itself all that it produces.

Now I am not going to make a campaign speech here. We must reserve our strength for the enemy. We must not fight each other too hard in the few remaining hours, but reserve our strength for the enemy. Let us have our little squabbles, and when we are through with them get together and pitch right into the middle of the battle.

I want to thank you one and all for this vote of confidence that you have cast for a Wisconsin nominee, for I don't consider it a personal victory; but I do promise you that everything that I can do shall be done to make this next campaign the liveliest fight the enemy has ever known.

I thank you one and all.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now before the house is on the motion of Comrade Spargo that we adjourn to meet at nine o'clock tonight.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): Is it understood that we may also take part in the parade?

THE CHAIRMAN: You may do what you please about the parade.

DEL. BESSEMER: If a parade has been arranged it is discourteous to the local committee to ignore them. I move to amend that we meet at 8:30 for the parade and to hear speeches from our presidential and vice-presidential candidates, at the end of which time we shall resume the business of the convention.

The amendment as offered by Delegate Bessemer was carried and the convention adjourned to meet at 8:30 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.

Chairman Duncan called the convention to order at 8:30 p. m.
Consideration of the report of the Committee on Constitution.

CONSTITUTION.

Article III of the Constitution was read by the Secretary, and there being no objection it was adopted.

Article IV was read.
DEL. RUTHENBERG (Ohio): I move that the words "shall consist of the State Secretaries of all organized states and territories" be stricken out and the words "or major fraction thereof" be inserted after "3,000 members." (Seconded.) In order to get the amendment clear, I simply want to return to the former section, Article IV, Section 1. If the Secretary will take the old Constitution, I will read it so as to make it clear. "Sec. 1. Each organized state or territory shall be represented on the National Committee by one member and by an addition member for every 2,000 members or major fraction thereof in good standing in the party." The object of this amendment is to take the State Secretaries off the National Committee. I do not believe it is good policy to make the State Secretaries members of our National Committee. When we select a man in a state to serve us as State Secretary, we select him because of his executive ability and not particularly because of his knowledge in regard to the organization at large in the entire country. And I submit that the average State Secretary, at least in a state where there is a large organization such as we have in Ohio, is too busy to keep in touch with and study the affairs of the national organization, because his

hands are full with the affairs of the local organization. I do not believe we should elect a man to one office and impose on him the duties of another office. We should select our National Committeemen because we think they are fitted for that office, and not for State Secretary, as this provision which the committee has submitted to us implies. I believe, therefore, that we should return to the old provision and strike out the reference to State Secretaries.

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): I wish to support the amendment of the comrade delegate from Ohio. Further on in this Constitution large and extended and important powers are given to the National Committee, and the proposals of the committee carry, and I believe that it is of the greatest importance that the most able and qualified men in each state, men that are intimate with the whole movement, not only of the state, but of the nation, should find their way eventually to the National Committee. Hitherto, this National Committee of our party has been comparatively a perfunctory body. Its duties may be specified, but they have been formal duties. They have not had responsibility placed upon them. By this new Constitution, the intention is to make the National Committee the real administrative body of the Socialist party. Now, in some states—in all our states—we are looking more and more for the best qualified executives; men that can handle details; men that are intimate with all the little things that arise in the state administration; men of capacity for local work. In the State of California we have recently revised our State Constitution by making our State Secretary appointive by

the State Board of Control, and not elective, for the purpose of finding a capable, energetic, administrative official. I believe that it would be a misfortune to have all the State Secretaries of the United States of America on the National Committee. I hope that the amendment of the delegate from Ohio will pass, and that we will return to the old Constitution in this respect, with the change of 2,000 to 3,000 in order that it shall be adapted to the growing conditions of the party.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): As one of the State Secretaries who, by virtue of the provisions of this new Constitution, will form part of the National Committee, I want to support the amendment offered by Comrade Ruthenberg. While I do not agree with the comrade in so far as the ability of the State Secretaries and their knowledge of the organization outside of their own state is concerned, at the same time I, nevertheless, fail to see any reason whatever why they ought necessarily to be made members of the National Committee. I contend that in many places our State Secretary, if he wishes to be a member of the National Committee, can secure the election in his own state without making it necessary by a mere Constitutional provision to make him a de facto member of the committee, whether the rank and file of the state desire him to be a member of the committee or not. I believe, in view of the extraordinary power to be conferred on the National Committee, and the fact that this committee is to become a real, active body instead of a mere figurehead under our organization, it is very important to make every member of that committee elected by the referendum vote in their respective states; and also in view of the fact that in some states, in fact the most important states, the State Secretary is not elected by referendum vote, but his membership in the State Committee is subject to recall by the state, it is not a very wise move to have him become a member of the National Committee; because, as I understand it, it is making the National Committee elected by the rank and file, subject to recall by the rank and file, and from the fact that a number of the State Secretaries are appointed instead of being elected by the rank and file, it is not very advisable to make them members of the National Committee.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. PANKIN (of the Jewish Agitation Bureau): I believe it a very unwise thing for us to make it mandatory by the Constitution that the state officers of the party in the different states shall constitute the National Committee. It seems to me that the State Secretaries have sufficient work to do in their respective states without burdening them with the work of the National Committee, and therefore I am in favor of the amendment made by the delegate from the state of Ohio that we have a body entirely different from the State Secretaries to constitute the National Committee. Let us not turn over the party to the petty officers of the party. Let us have it managed by the comrades at large.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I want to beg of you to go very slow in voting for the amendment. As far as I am concerned now I think I speak for every member of the committee. If you adopt the amendment, we say to you, "Tear up the Constitution. You have taken the heart out of it." Don't say no. For twelve years

Hillquit and certain other members, and myself and certain other members have been on opposite sides. Hillquit and others have claimed in the name of efficiency that we wanted to do away with a certain amount of the referendum. On the other hand, I have always stood, and others with me, for giving all power into the hands of the rank and file. Now, we compromised and we got together because we thought we found a way of putting the national organization into direct touch and control of the rank and file, and at the same time getting efficiency. Now, you comrades and you State Secretaries, you go slow before you vote in favor of this amendment. Time and time again we have had complaint of lack of harmony between the state offices and the national offices. We have had open conflict, or we have had indifference on the part of the State Secretaries. Under our plan we make the state organization and the national organization one as far as being able to get in touch with each other and understand each other. What do we propose? Once a year a gathering of those men, in the first place, that are able to talk for their states because no man in the state like the State Secretary knows that movement in that state. He knows the workers. The comrade who proposed this amendment said they elected for their State Secretaries men of executive ability. That is exactly what we are trying to put on this National Committee; not the men who happen, because they are speakers or writers, to be the best known in the state and be able to get elected on the National Committee; but the men that are on the job, the Jimmy Higginsons, the Billy Baxters, that know the crowd because they are in touch with the crowd we want them on that National Committee so that when they meet once a year when it comes to the question of routing speakers or the best distribution of literature and a better way of carrying on the work and getting every possible dollar's worth of value for every penny we spend, we will have a man that can within a week go out of that town and arrange a national meeting, that will arrange for practically an entire year's work and who will understand the plan because he helped to make the plan. I beg you not to stand for this amendment, because if you do stand for this amendment you are only going back to the time when every Tom, Dick and Harry could be elected to the National Committee and you did not know anything about the condition of things. The National Committeemen have the duties of planning the general work. Yes, and who can do it better than the State Secretaries. What are their duties? To talk to the men and women as National Secretaries, to run the party between meetings, who is better acquainted, better able to judge as to who will make a good National Secretary than those men and those women who as State Secretaries have learned what a National Secretary ought to be; people who know how to do it? There is another thing we have in mind. Gradually as this party develops we are going to develop—not the speakers, for we have speakers; not necessarily the writers, but the fellows that know how to organize and take the forces and put them together. We are hoping that out of this we will get a method of promoting and bringing up the work and gradually developing it until we have experts along every line. Now, as far as I am concerned, I am only one and I have only

the voice and influence of one; but having sat on this committee and worked over it as we have done in the committee, I want to say that when you adopt the amendment I take no further heart in the thing, because, now, we have taken the old machine with the old inefficiency, and in addition to that we have taken the control of the national organization, out of the rank and file; because the only thing that connects that directly with the rank and file, after all, are these State Secretaries. They are in daily touch with the rank and file. That was the reason I was willing to accept it; that was the reason Comrade Brewer was willing to accept it; because we said these men are right in touch with the rank and file. We have through them a daily referendum, a weekly referendum, a monthly referendum. I beg of you to vote down the amendment. You have appointed men to do this work of revising the Constitution. There is not a line there but what is related to every other line. We do not take one paragraph by itself, we build this thing like you build a house from the basement to the roof. Try out the plan, and if it don't work out in a year, then it will be time to make the changes that my comrade over there presents for you to make. (Applause.)

The question was then put on the amendment of Del. Ruthenberg, and the amendment was lost by a vote of 65 to 153.

DEL. J. E. COHEN (Pa.): I move that in place of the first sentence of Section 1 the following be substituted: "The National Committee shall consist of 100 members, to be apportioned among the states and territories in the following manner: State Secretaries from all organized states and territories, and additional members in proportion to the average national dues paid by the organization in such states and territories during the preceding year. (Seconded.) On Page 9, Section 4 of Article IX, reads: "Delegates to be apportioned among the states," etc. That is a very good proposition because it comes from Pennsylvania, was adopted by the Pennsylvania convention, and the delegates were instructed to vote to that effect. I think it is a very good proposition that the National Committee shall consist of a definite number who shall be competent to do the executive work, and not of a number that varies from year to year according to how the membership changes. And therefore I hope that you will vote for this new proposition making a definite number who shall be competent to do the executive work of the party from year to year, to be reviewed by the National Convention, which is a much larger number and which meets only once in four years; and thereby your work will be done in an efficient manner as the Constitution desires.

Del. Smith (Mont.) took the floor.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): Permit me to make a statement that may have something to do with Comrade Smith's talk. I want to say that we figured out the probable number of members we would have on the committee. At the beginning we will have from 68 to 74, and we figured that with the present rate of progress, when the next National Convention meets it will be about 95 to 100, which is practically what you want, without changing this as we have it in the Constitution there.

DEL. SMITH (Mont.): I seconded the amendment chiefly because discussion was stopped on the previous amendment. I

wish to discuss the principle involved in the plan outlined by this new Constitution, and not particularly in favor of any particular or specific change in the plan as outlined; except that I shall support the amendment proposed by the comrade here because no other change is provided at this time. I should be in favor of the amendment. The plan as outlined by the Committee on Constitution is this; and we cannot discuss any part of that plan without understanding and considering the entire plan. The plan is that the National Committee—

DEL. EDWARDS (Tex.): A point of order, that we are discussing the amendment, with a motion to adopt the section as a whole, and not discussing this amendment which he manifestly states he has not much interest in.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade says he will link up the support of this amendment to the matters he is presenting now.

DEL. SMITH: The proposition is that the State Secretaries shall constitute the National Committee; that the National Executive Committee of five members shall be selected by the National Committee, which is composed of the State Secretaries. The Executive Secretary shall also be selected in like manner. Now, I want to say that not only are the National Secretaries not all elected by referendum vote; the State Secretaries are not all elected by referendum vote, as has been shown by the comrade from New York, but I want to show another evil in this system. The Executive Committee, while it is elected by the National Committee, is not subject to recall by the membership at large.

DEL. HOAN (Wis.): It is.

DEL. SMITH: Show me where. Here is the proposition that Comrade Goebel calls attention to: The members of the Executive Committee, Woman's National Committee and Executive Secretary and general correspondent may at any time and on proper motion be temporarily suspended from office by the National Committee, and by nobody else.

DEL. HOAN: There is another proposition.

DEL. SMITH: Members of the Executive Committee, Woman's National Committee, the Executive Secretary, General Correspondent, etc., may be recalled at any time by the membership in the party, and may be temporarily suspended during the initiation and taking of a national referendum. I confess I am wrong on this point, which is due to not having read the entire thing through. (Applause.) Now, I trust you will have patience. This is the first time during this convention that I have asked for the privilege of the floor, and it is not because I want to show myself, but because I am interested in this proposition. Now, I want to call your attention to the chief points involved in this proposition. The State Secretaries of the Socialist party are the executives of the party within their respective states. They are, as has been stated here, in daily communication with the majority in the state, and without regard to the good faith of the different state organizations, they are the persons who have a tremendous personal influence with their states. They are the ones whose decision on any referendum, should they become interested on either side of a referendum, would have great influence in carrying that referendum out or defeating it, as the case might be. These people are not the people who should constitute the National Committee of the Socialist party.

The National Committee of the Socialist party should consist of such men or women, as the case may be, as have no greater influence with the membership in the state, by virtue of any official position, than any other members of the Socialist party within their respective states. Now, we will suppose that the National Executive Committee, selected by the National Committee of State Secretaries, should pursue a course that might be contrary to the judgment of a large proportion of members within certain states and they would be required to initiate a referendum against it. Then we would be confronted with this situation: The State Secretaries, who constitute the National Committee and who are instrumental in electing the National Executive Committee, would be charged with the work of taking a referendum against their own policies, and I maintain that absolute impartiality could not be maintained under those circumstances. We ought not to have referendums conducted by people who are interested particularly in those referendums (applause), especially by people who are in daily communication with the entire membership of the party throughout the entire nation. All of the State Secretaries are in communication with all of the members of the entire Socialist party, and I maintain that a machine can be built up by a National Executive Committee and a majority of the National Committee, composed of State Secretaries, which no power on earth can break down. (Applause.) Comrades, I say this from having had experience as Secretary of an organization. I am not going to say what organization it is or anything about it, but I have had sufficient experience to know that the Secretary of an organization can wield a tremendous influence. The chairman of this committee has already called your attention to the fact that the National Secretary, simply because he is National Secretary, can be re-elected National Secretary unless there are some very extraordinary circumstances connected with the election or the nominations. It is almost impossible to defeat a National Secretary, or a State Secretary, I might add, even though he did not use undue influence; and I want to say that when all of the influence that a State Secretary may have may be used, there is no power in the Socialist party that can defeat the State Secretary or the measures in which the State Secretary may be interested.

DEL. PATTERSON (Ohio): I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment. Where it says that the National Committee shall consist of State Secretaries, I wish to add in there "or such other persons as the state may designate."

THE CHAIRMAN: This is hardly an amendment to the amendment. That is in the nature of an original amendment to the proposition of the Committee.

DEL. PATTERSON: What I want to do is to leave this part optional with the state.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will have an opportunity to present that later, but it is not in the nature of an amendment to the amendment.

The previous question was ordered on the amendment offered by Del. Cohen.

DEL. SPARGO: I am opposed to the idea of making it a condition of the membership of the National Committee that the representatives shall be the State Secretaries. I am, in other words, opposed to making the State Secretary, by virtue of his position as State Secretary, a member of the National Committee. I believe that is a very dangerous power and a very dangerous precedent to set in our party.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Just two points about the amendment and the motion before you leaving the State Secretaries as members of the National Committee. The only thing the Cohen amendment seeks to do is to fix the membership of the National Committee. Now, the Constitution Committee did not deem that expedient, for this reason: That on the basis proposed, one committeeman for every three thousand members, will have today about seventy-five members of the National Committee. There is no reason why we should today increase it to 100. That will simply mean more expense and a little more cumbersome machinery when the party has grown till it automatically reaches the 100 mark, and when it threatens to become unwieldy, as our conventions begin to threaten already, then we can always limit it. At present there is no such danger. I may also say, although the question is not directly involved but was nearly brought up, that we considered very carefully the danger or alleged danger that may come from the influence of the State Secretaries, and we came to this conclusion, that the State Secretaries represent the interests of their states, and when a majority of the State Secretaries come together on any one plan or proposition it is no more a clique, it is an expression of the will of a majority of a majority of the party, and they are welcome to it. (Applause.)

The Cohen amendment was then put to a vote and was lost.

At this point, on motion, consideration of the Constitution was suspended and Comrade Emil Seidel, of Milwaukee, nominee for Vice-President, and Comrade Charles Edward Russell, Delegate from New York, were called on and addressed the convention and visitors.

At the conclusion of the campaign speeches, the convention resumed consideration of the Constitution.

DEL. PATTERSON (Ohio): In the first section it says the national committee shall consist of state secretaries, and so on. I wish to offer the following amendment: "The national committee shall consist of one representative from each state, and an additional delegate for every 2,500 members, or major fraction thereof." (Seconded.)

Del. Branstetter made a point of order that substantially the same proposition had been voted down. The point of order was sustained by the Chair.

DEL. STITT WILSON (Cal.): I move an amendment, as follows: "The national committee shall consist of the state secretaries of all organized states and territories, or such other persons as the members of the party in the states shall elect by referendum vote," and so on. (Seconded.)

At this point, on motion of Del. Hogan (Ark.) the convention adjourned until 9:00 o'clock Saturday morning.

SEVENTH DAY'S SESSION.

The convention was called to order at 9 a. m. by Chairman Duncan.

The following were nominated as chairman for the day:

Goebel, N. J.; Killingbeck, N. J.; Hogan, Ark.; Thompson, Wis.; Gaylord, Wis.; Slayton, Pa.

All declined excepting Comrades Gaylord, Goebel and Slayton.

The vote resulted as follows: Gaylord, 61; Goebel, 62; Slayton, 19.

Comrade Goebel of New Jersey was declared elected chairman of the day.

CHAIRMAN GOEBEL: On the last day of the convention there is always a rush and pressure of business. We have the Constitution Committee report to finish, the report of the Woman's Committee, the Committee on Party Owned Press, and many other important matters. We also have the rule adjourning this convention at midnight tonight. This all means that we must be as quick as possible, and very likely the chairman in trying to get through with business at times will seem to be arbitrary. If you think injustice is done I want you to appeal at once from the Chair. I am going to do the best I can to complete the business of the convention and I want you all to help me out.

Nominations for vice chairman were then made as follows: Thompson, Wis.; Slayton, Pa.; Strebel, N. Y.; Hogan, Ark.; Ruthenberg, Ohio; Collins, Colo.

Delegates Ruthenberg and Collins were the only delegates who accepted.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ruthenberg, 59; Collins, 57. Delegate Ruthenberg was elected vice chairman of the day.

On motion the roll call and the reading of minutes were dispensed with.

The secretary reported that John Edward Russell had been seated by the New York delegation as alternate for Charles Edward Russell.

C. L. Brunier was seated in place of E. L. Regulin of California.

S. A. Benbrook was seated in place of M. A. Smith, Texas.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Communications were read from Caspar Bauer, San Diego.

J. D. Osborn, Oakland, Cal.

Young People's Socialist Educational and Dramatic Club, Brooklyn.

Workmen's Circle, New York.

Board of Directors, Labor League, Boston, Mass.

Jacob S. Rosenberg, Worcester, Mass.

Branch 4 Socialist Party, Worcester, Mass.

Local Rochester, New York.

Bohemian Daily, New York.

Bohemian Workingmen's Gymnastic Union of America.

G. E. Daniels, Augusta, Ga.

William Voss, Chairman, Winnipeg, Man.

A. C. Wyman, Boston, Mass.

Organizer E. Kaplan, Hartford, Conn.

N. Mahlon, Pittsburg, Pa.

Syracuse Local, N. Y.

Educational League, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. R. Metcalfe, Sioux City, Ia.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is the report of the Committee on Constitution, Article 4, Section 1.

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): I propose the following amendment: "The National Committee shall consist of the state secretaries of all organized states and territories, or in place of said secretaries such other parties as the members of that state shall elect by referendum vote."

The rest to follow as it is in the report.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): A point of order. Yesterday they voted down an amendment that made it optional to select a member in place of the state secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is made that this amendment is in effect a duplication of the amendment defeated last evening. I rule that Comrade Branstetter's point is well taken and the amendment is out of order.

DEL. WILSON: Will you permit me to word my amendment in another way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let the Chair say that he will not accept any amendment by which the state secretaries are excluded.

DEL. DUNCAN (Mont.): I appeal from the decision of the Chair, and the ground for my appeal is that the chairman has no right to gag an amendment to this article in any respect. The amendment now offered is not the same as the amendment offered yesterday. I think the convention should demand that every possible point of view should be given an opportunity to be heard and the proposal voted upon.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair's position is that this very matter involved in this amendment was debated and voted upon. Chairman Duncan yesterday ruled precisely as the chairman has ruled this morning.

(Cries of "Oh, no.")

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, he did. The proper method of procedure would be to move to re-consider.

On a vote the Chair's ruling was not sustained and the amendment offered by Delegate Wilson was declared in order.

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): I am very loath to offer an amendment here after the consideration that has been given to this matter by the seven wise men. They have labored over this and have doubtless prepared a better instrument than the one with which we have been working. But I fear that this is lodging altogether too much power in the hands of state secretaries. This national committee will consist of probably 65 or 70 members to begin with and between 40 and 50 of them will be state secretaries. The various states differ in their method of electing state secretaries. Some are elected by a referendum of the entire state membership. Some

are elected by nine or ten committeemen of the state. Some of them are appointed by the state boards of control. In the state of California we follow the method of hiring for our state secretary a man specially capable of handling the details of the office. We hire him and fire him by a vote of a limited number of people whom we elect to carry on the policy of the party in the state.

There is another point in this. The National Committee always meets in national convention years. That will mean that in the national convention every state secretary will be a delegate to the national convention. That will not do. People will not send some one else to this convention, they will save the fare of one man and the man who will have to come will be the state secretary, with the result that we shall have fifty state secretaries in our next national convention. That is a dangerous concentration of power in those men and it ought to be voted down.

There is still another point. Under this new constitution the state secretaries, if they form a majority of the national committee would elect the national executive committee. It is easy to see that the national executive committee could be selected from the state secretaries and very likely it would be. If the state secretaries are the most capable men for the national committee by the same reasoning five or six or seven state secretaries are likely to be the most capable men for the national executive committee. Now, I submit to you that the state secretaries are not necessarily the men most capable of determining the policy of the national movement of the national Socialist party. They are not elected in our states to determine policies. They are elected to carry out the policies determined by the state; they are elected we may say as our clerks, not as determining factors in our policies. In California when they seek to determine our policy we determine them out of office. Have we not had to discipline state secretaries all over this nation for assuming power and trying to determine the policy of the Socialist party. So I say to you that fifty of these secretaries in the national committee would not be men qualified to determine the policy of the national party when they are not the men elected to determine our policy in the several states. I hope that you will not permit this section of the constitution as recommended by the committee to stand.

A DELEGATE: Tell us what your motion is.

DEL. WILSON: "The National Committee shall consist of the State Secretaries of all organized states and territories or such other person as the members of the party in the state shall elect by referendum vote." I will add one provision with the consent of my second. "Provided that the State Secretary shall always by virtue of his office be a nominee for election to the National Committee." That will make it possible for the state membership to elect the State Secretary if they see fit. I believe if my second will consent this will save us from a difficulty that is involved. I would like to see men as familiar with our affairs as are the State Secretaries on this National Committee but to pack the National Committee with State Secretaries is a dangerous concentration of power.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the second accept the addition?

DEL. PATTERSON (O.): I refuse to accept the amendment.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): Don't be deceived by this cry of bosses or boss rule because the constitution expressly states that no member of the National Committee is eligible on the National Executive Committee.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will Comrade Branstetter read the clause that he thinks is there.

DEL. BRANSTETTER: That was my understanding. It is stated that we have perhaps a better constitution than the one we have been working under. If we have a better constitution it is because the state organizations and the National Committee and the National Executive Committee are to be brought into closer touch and harmony with each other than ever before. The trouble with our present organization is that there is constant friction between the state organizations, between the state secretaries and the executive committee, between the state secretaries and the national secretary. The purpose of this proposed constitution is to get harmonious work between the state and national organization. Some one has said that about the only purpose of the national organization is to administer affairs between the states. There is nobody so well fitted to represent the interests of the separate states as the State Secretaries. They are in actual touch with the state affairs. In the smaller states with only one or two thousand members the State Secretary is not a clerk merely hired to keep the books, but in all the smaller state organizations he is the man who more than any other does know the needs of that organization. He is not a clerk, he is their spokesman, he is their organizer. In the smaller states the State Secretary is generally the only man in the state who knows the needs of the organization. Where the state has ten or twelve thousand members, where the State Secretary may be largely a clerk, hired for his executive ability, there will be three or four others as representatives on the National Committee, and therefore no injustice will be worked, while in the smaller states the most efficient man will be elected. It has been said here that the State Secretaries will arrogate power to themselves. That can be attended to by the state organization. If you have a man in your state that you can't unseat the rest of us can't help you. But I am sure that when the rest of the members are ready to unseat him he will be unseated. But so long as he is the State Secretary and so long as the transactions between the state and national bodies are carried on by the State Secretaries it will help towards a harmonious relationship if this is adopted. I believe a majority of the state will remove a secretary who is not satisfactory when the time comes.

Again they argue that many of the State Secretaries are only executive officers. What is this National Committee? We haven't formed a committee to control the policies of the organization. The national convention and the referendum declare the policy of the party. The purpose of the National Committee is not to declare the principles of this organization. The purpose of the National Committee is to carry out the plans, dictated by referendum and by our national conventions. And I do not know anybody so well fitted to help in carrying out, to formulate methods of carrying out the plans of the national organization as the State Secretaries under whose

direction in the respective states those plans are to be carried out.

The previous question was moved and carried.

DEL. STRICKLAND (Ohio): It seems to me that one point has been overlooked. In the acceptance of this amendment we are still going out from here if it is adopted, in that form, with the committee already elected, but we are merely leaving it optional to the states to make a change afterwards if they desire. We are not spoiling the plan; we are not taking the heart out of the constitution, but we are making it optional with the states to change that requirement if later they find it necessary or desirable. We go out from here with the plan in force if this be adopted by the referendum vote following the convention, as it will undoubtedly do. Then the committee is already elected, at least the State Secretaries are elected and you already have your National Committee under the new plan. Now under the plan of state autonomy if later any state desires to change the arrangement and choose a different member of the committee by referendum they have the right to do it. Not only that but in the larger states they have to do it any way. So we are not spoiling the plan, but we are allowing larger scope for state autonomy, and we are allowing the comrades in every state an opportunity to adapt themselves to this plan in the very best way. We are not spoiling the plan. We are making it possible for all the states, regardless of the method by which they elect a State Secretary, we are giving each state the chance to thoroughly cooperate with the plan that has been offered by the seven wise men on the platform.

DEL. KELSO (N. D.): Suppose a State Secretary is elected a member of the National Committee, can he be recalled as a member of the National Committee? If he is not recalled as State Secretary and is recalled as National Committeeman what condition are you in?

DEL. HILLQUIT: As the National Committeeman he is an officer of his state, not of the national organization. He could be recalled by his state but not by general referendum.

DEL. RICHARDSON (Cal.): There is a good deal of undue excitement about this. Every point that has been mentioned here was thrashed out from A to Z in the committee. Some one brought up every one of these objections. See some of the mistakes that have been made. The comrade that spoke last tells you that these secretaries go into office at once. That is because he hasn't read the constitution. It provides that between the time when this constitution takes effect and the first day of April, 1913, all the state organizations shall elect members of the National Committee in accordance with the provisions of this constitution. They do not come in until the regular term of office is up. Comrade Wilson tells you that nobody would go to the conventions, or to meetings of the National Committee except the State Secretaries because the states would want to save the fare and would not send anybody but the secretary.

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): I didn't state that. **DEL. RICHARDSON:** Very well, you said they would be the only ones that would go. Now the fares are paid for the national committeemen.

Now it is said that the State Secretaries would constitute a majority. I have looked over a great many votes that have been taken on important questions and if you are as familiar with that as I am you know

on the average of 50 per cent do not vote. They don't know anything about the question. Now we want these things in the hands of men who will pay attention to what is going on, men through whose hands all this business must go. The State Secretary is in touch with the business of the national office. He necessarily has to be in touch with it. He is the man who knows most about it.

Another thing, we know what wranglings have been going on between the states, some of them almost seceding because of lack of harmonious action. If we can bring these State Secretaries together once a year and let them compare notes it will do more for harmonious work between the states than anything else that could occur. Your committee thrashed out all these points and we know what we are talking about.

Again Comrade Wilson speaks of the necessity of firing them out of office sometimes. There is nothing to prevent that. There is nothing to prevent the state firing its National Committeeman. And about one-third of the states should fire their National Committeemen now for not attending to business that is submitted to them. We want a live, active committee, in touch with the work and the needs of the Socialist party which will bring about harmonious work throughout the nation and you will get that through the State Secretaries. They will not be a majority of the committee, but they will be a live energetic part of the committee, they will know what has to be done.

We hope you will support this. We believe it is right; that it is best for the party. There is no danger of concentrating power. The Executive Committee can be recalled either by the National Committee or the membership. All the members of the National Committee can be recalled by their States. If you were going to be afraid of the power that is vested in those bodies where in the name of heaven will you vest power? The committee are not afraid of it. Consider it wisely and vote for this section.

A division was called for upon the amendment offered by Delegate Wilson. The amendment was carried by a vote of 111 aye to 73 no.

DEL. MENG (Ark.): I move that we reconsider the vote by which the State Secretaries are members of the National Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: That motion is out of order until such time as other business has intervened.

DEL. CUPPLES (Wash.): I move to re-commit this section and have the committee bring in a report in favor of a yearly conference of the State Secretaries instead of making the State Secretaries members of the National Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I shall have to rule your motion out of order as not relevant to this paragraph.

DEL. CUPPLES: I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: State the ground for your appeal.

DEL. CUPPLES: I appeal from the decision on the ground that I want this question re-committed with instructions—

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: State your parliamentary grounds.

DEL. CUPPLES: That is a parliamentary ground.

DEL. GOEBEL: My understanding of the rules is that the order under which we are proceeding is this particular section

and that that motion would pertain to another subject.

On a vote the Chair was sustained.

The previous question was then ordered upon the paragraph as amended.

DEL. MENG: I want to speak against this paragraph. It should not meet with the approval of the majority of this convention. Del. Goebel said that we should not tinker with this constitution because the nine wise men of the committee had given it such deep consideration, had weighed and considered everything and we must have respect for their superior ability, and be very careful how we approach this holy of holies, that we must take off our shoes and approach softly, for the wise men have spoken. Why did he say that? There is a reason, as Comrade Charley Post says. Don't attack this beautiful structure. It is built from the ground up. He is a carpenter. He knows how to build a constitution, so don't touch it. There is a good reason why we should not touch it. It is built on a foundation of sand. If you touch it it is gone; and they know it. I have all respect and reverence for these most potent, grave and reverent seniors who have undertaken to draft this constitution. I take off my hat to the famous gentlemen that we have here. I believe every delegation is opposed to making the State Secretaries the Pooh-Bah of the Socialist movement, the high lord everything else. In our State we have had one man who is the whole thing. The State Secretary is a clerk. He has enough to do if he does that well. I want to change this to say if he is State Secretary he shall not be eligible to the office of National Committeeman.

DEL. HILLQUIT: The committee at this point desires to call the attention of the delegates to this fact, that we are on the second page of a sixteen-page document, and this is Saturday, the last day of the convention.

DEL. HICKEY (Tex.): What will you do with that proposition in a State where there is no State Secretary? In our State we had to kill the State Committee, the State Executive Committee and are prepared to fire the State Secretary. Therefore I want to know what you are going to do in a State where there is no State Secretary.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I must say that the committee has had Texas in view. The only trouble with us was we didn't know whether Texas would fire its National Committeeman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is on the adoption of this paragraph.

DEL. SLAYTON: I move as a substitute that the whole matter be adopted as it now stands, the whole sixteen pages.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will not entertain that motion, but the Chair will entertain the motion to adopt the whole of Article 4, and in order to do that, you would have to call for the reading of the article.

DEL. SLAYTON: Then I ask for the reading and adoption of this article. Sections 3, 4 and 5 of Article 4 were then read by the Secretary.

DEL. SLAYTON: My motion is that that article be read be adopted.

The motion was duly seconded.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I do not think the committee will be at all favorable to this motion. I think it is not a very wise procedure after wasting four hours on one section then to swallow the whole of the rest of it without consideration or discussion. I think we shall do very much better to

have every section read in order and if there is no objection adopt it and pass to the next. There are important questions in the rest of this constitution that should be considered and discussed seriously.

THE CHAIRMAN: The matter before the house is this: The original motion is that we adopt Section 2 of Article 4. Del. Slayton offers as a substitute that we adopt the entire Article 4 as read.

DEL. SLAYTON: The reason for my motion is that in debating other matters here on the floor at times in amending part of an article we run up against a contradiction in another part. I do not believe that we should do as much injury if we would adopt the whole, try to work it out, and then come back another time, or by referendum, change and amend where it has been found by experience to be necessary to change and amend.

DEL. BESSEMER (O.): I wish to offer an amendment to Section 2.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should have to decide that amendment out of order. Comrade Slayton's motion is a substitute.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I wish to endorse Hillquit's proposition. I think this discussion now is the best proof that instead of expediting matters you are going to delay them. I don't think there is anybody going to make an objection to many of these paragraphs, and I think if we vote this down and get through with it, adopting each section or defeating each section as it comes up without unnecessary discussion, we shall get through much more quickly.

The motion of Delegate Slayton was defeated.

DEL. STRICKLAND: Why can't we adopt the rule that was followed yesterday that in considering this serialim when a section is read it be considered adopted if there is no objection without a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will so rule hereafter.

DEL. BESSEMER: I wish to move an amendment to Section 2. I wish to add after the last word "Persons who have been elected to political offices shall not be eligible."

The motion was seconded.

DEL. BESSEMER: I am opposed to any of our elective officials having any power in the organization. I believe that when we elect officials from the Socialist party we are simply electing servants of the Socialist party, and I believe that the rank and file should be in a position to instruct those men that we elect in any way whatsoever that we wish and they should be deprived of any power to instruct themselves at all. Therefore I believe this amendment should be carried. I believe that a Congressman or a Senator or the Mayor of a city elected by the Socialist party is there as a servant of the people and the whole power of instructing him should be in the hands of the rank and file, and I think this should be passed unanimously without discussion.

DEL. ENDRES (N. Y.): The deliberations in this convention during the past week have impressed me very favorably. But I have found that almost every one who gets on the floor has some kind of suspicion against some other member. This is not acting in a comradely spirit. Here we are wrangling about things and do not come to any conclusions. We have been monkeying around with this thing for about seven hours. Now in regard to the motion made by our comrade from Ohio, I want to tell you this, that if nominations

are made by any local body for public office they are going to select those in whom they have confidence to carry out the work of the comrades in that locality. The larger the territory from which that comrade is to be elected the more capable he is expected to be. We should take the force that has developed in the party to do the work of the party. This proposition is that we should take them out of the active work of the party when it comes to our own organization. Now just take a look at Germany. Wherever there is any important party work to be done you will always find that it is the men who have been prominent in the Reichstag or who have filled other important elective public offices who are called upon to do that work. Vote this thing down here. Let us place confidence in the men to whom we give the power, and in the remainder of this discussion let us be harmonious and not acrimonious, let us not be so suspicious of each other.

DEL. HICKEY: One of the most prominent members in this convention discussed this matter with me, or rather sought to discuss this matter with me last evening, and I absolutely refused to discuss it, because there are certain things that can not be discussed. This proposition that a man holding a political office shall not also hold executive office is such an elementary proposition in democracy that same men should not waste two minutes over it. Now in a little story of sixteen columns that I pulled off about this national convention last week I pointed out that any one elected by this convention, or rather elected to office and also held an office in the Socialist party would be liable to punishment under the Texas law because in Texas the primary law provides a penalty for holding executive and political office at the same time. A DELEGATE: Is that a good election law?

DEL. HICKEY: Don't ask such foolish questions. I am not concerned with what they do in Germany. I am concerned with an elementary principle of democracy that is recognized in every portion of the United States. I believe with the delegate from Ohio that the rank and file should attend to this thing of political offices being in a place to criticize themselves and instruct themselves.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I think if this motion were put in a sensible form it should read: "Every member of the party elected to public office shall, ex-officio, be a member of the National Committee." The party in Germany has that provision. And when Comrade Hickey says that he is not concerned with Germany but he is concerned with Texas, I simply wish to call Comrade Hickey's attention to the fact that the Socialist comrades in Germany have made somewhat better progress than the comrades in Texas. We can well afford to imitate the comrades in Germany rather than those in Texas.

The trouble with our ultra-democratic friends is that they have set forms of words and phrases. If, for instance, Comrade Hickey would consider that we are not speaking about two offices within the same organization, an executive office and a legislative office in the Socialist party. But we are speaking of offices in the Socialist party organization and a political office in a municipality, in a State Legislature or the Congress of the United States. Where is the contradiction? What he has in mind is the separation of powers and functions, the system of checks and balances, all of

which have been accepted long ago by true, sensible democracy, and he mixes up the Socialist party, the National government, the capitalistic State government in one common pot. Now that is the contradiction. We have been in the habit of doing this highly democratic thing. We first select our officers, our servants, and when we have elected them the presumption then is that they are thieves and scoundrels until they prove the contrary. Every one of our officials—when we want to be really democratic—we frown upon them. We say, "You have the power now to steal; now you prove that you haven't stolen or that you don't steal." That is not democracy. We are not in this party for power. We are not in this party for self-enrichment. The men elected to our National Executive Committee, the men elected to our Congress, the men elected to our State Legislature, the men that we elect as dog catchers or the men that we elect as local Secretaries, all serve the party in their various capacities and they do absolutely nothing more, and the more we have of active, competent men in all possible fields of usefulness, the better for the Socialist party. You speak about the power of these men. What about the power of the party press? How about our newspaper editors, Comrade Hickey? As opposed to this proposition, why not adopt the rule that no editor of a Socialist party paper, the man who has power to mold the opinion of delegates, should ever be a delegate to a National Convention.

DEL. HICKEY: I wish to say that I accept that.

DEL. BESSEMER (Ohio): I accept that proposition.

(Cries of "Vote, vote.")

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Bessemer, you are out of order.

DEL. BESSEMER: I simply rise for the purpose of accepting the proposition if he wants to make it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The matter before the house is this amendment.

THE SECRETARY: The amendment is offered by Bessemer of Ohio. "Persons who have been elected to or who hold public offices shall not be eligible."

The motion of Comrade Bessemer was lost.

DEL. PATTERSON (Ohio): I move to incorporate into that section a provision suggested by Comrade Hillquit barring from membership in the convention editors of Socialist newspapers.

THE CHAIRMAN: I shall rule you out of order. Del. Hillquit's opinions on that question are not pertinent to this section. This section does not refer to the qualifications of delegates to the National Convention. That question is covered by another section.

Section 2 was then adopted as read. The Secretary then read Section 3 of Article IV.

DEL. BARNES (Pa.): I move to strike out from the fourth line all that follows the word "held." I want to strike out the words "in which years it shall hold its session in conjunction with the convention." I do not believe in having two organizations assembled at the same time when it appears that they will probably conflict. I am not in favor of holding a National Committee meeting in the year in which the National Convention is held. We can slip that year.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I second the amendment.

THE SECRETARY: Delegate Barnes moves to make Article IV, Section 3, read: "The National Committee shall meet in regular session on the first Sunday after the first Monday in May in each year, except in years when National Conventions of the party are to be held."

DEL. BARNES: That would mean that in that year they would not hold any annual meeting. I contend that it would not result well for the National Committee to meet in conjunction with the National Convention. They would conflict. When the convention is in session we do not need a meeting of the National Committee. The National Convention can take care of all questions.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): Comrade Barnes' proposition would be a very wise one if the National Committee were not charged with certain specific duties, which duties it must perform annually, such as the election of an Executive Committee, of a Secretary, of a Woman's Committee and the Secretary of that committee. The National Committee also has to render a report to the National Convention. The members of the National Committee will in all likelihood also be delegates to the convention. The only result then will be that a small portion of the National Committee—men who are not delegates to the convention will come to that meeting. There can be no conflict since the National Convention is always supreme. On the other hand we can not do away with the committee for the reason that it has important specific functions to perform.

DEL. BARNES: May I ask a question? Does the phrase "in conjunction" mean together?

DEL. HILLQUIT: It means at the same time. We state that it shall be held at definite times except in convention years when it shall hold its session in conjunction with, or at the same time with the convention.

DEL. BARNES: Not meet together. With this construction the point in my amendment is gone, and therefore with the consent of my second I withdraw my motion.

Section 3 was then adopted as read. Section 4, Article IV, was then read and adopted.

Section 5, Article IV, was then read. DEL. KOOP: I move to insert \$4 in place of \$2.50 in Section 5.

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): I move to amend by making it read "The members of the National Committee attending the meetings, and the delegates to the regular National Convention shall be paid from the Treasury their railroad fares and \$2.50 per day to cover expenses, but such pay and railroad fares shall not be paid until the committee meeting or the convention has adjourned."

The motion was seconded. THE CHAIRMAN: We have a separate clause on conventions. Suppose you just make your motion to refer to the members of the National Committee because under the head of the convention there is a clause that the delegate shall be paid on the same basis as members attending the National Committee meeting.

DEL. BROWN: Does that appear later on?

DEL. KOOP: I had a motion. THE CHAIRMAN: Was Comrade Koop's amendment seconded?

DEL. EDWARDS (Tex.): The point will be raised that we have consumed more than four hours on this report. We shall then

have to amend the rules in order to continue, and I should like to present this motion first: That the Secretary read the report now entirely through; second, that we debate for one hour thereafter; that at the end of that hour we vote on the proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your amendment is not in order at this time. It relates to the rules of the National Convention. We are discussing this section.

DEL. EDWARDS: My motion refers to the whole matter before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are right. The Secretary will read the motion.

The motion of Comrade Edwards was read by the Secretary.

DEL. EDWARDS: Many points that have been raised have been decided in favor of the committee by their pointing out that those very points have been covered in other paragraphs of the proposed constitution. It is apparent that at least a majority of us have not read this report through. I happen to have read it through, so I am not pleading laziness on my own part. An alternate section to any one of these sections may be presented to go along with the referendum by one-fourth of the delegates. In the hour that I suggest it would be possible to present many amendments on all important points as we read through the propositions. And finally it has all got to be submitted to a referendum vote at the end. Therefore I believe we will get all the important objections and features brought out in our debate and we will be able to go on and do the rest of our business. I submit this as a last point, that already the delegates have begun to go home and many of us are extremely desirous of getting away to-night and therefore if we are going to do much important business that is before us this will be as good a method of attending to this matter as we can devise in the short time at our disposal.

The motion of Delegate Edwards was carried.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Questions are being asked on the floor as to whether amendments can be offered while the reading proceeds. My understanding was the constitution was to be read through, then amendments were to be offered and at the end of an hour's discussion the whole matter was to be disposed of.

DEL. STRICKLAND: The Secretary wishes to state that his understanding of the motion is that the clerk shall read the remaining portion, that at the end of the reading there will be discussion for an hour on any amendments offered and then the vote will be taken.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I wish the Chairman would make a ruling so that afterwards the convention will know what powers it has.

THE CHAIRMAN: As the only way to avoid a tangle I will rule as Comrade Hillquit has suggested.

The Secretary then proceeded to read the remaining sections of the constitution.

Before the reading of Section 2, of Article V, Delegate Hillquit said:

DEL. HILLQUIT: The next section is not properly printed. It should read: "The National Committee shall elect an Executive Committee of five members and a Woman's National Committee of seven members; no two members of either of these committees shall be from the same state."

At the conclusion of the reading the committee made the following explanation:

DEL. HILLQUIT: We have made no recommendation as to party press, or foreign-speaking organizations because there are special committees on those matters. As to the foreign speaking matters, this committee has adopted the report of that committee, and the recommendations will be included in the constitution. I don't suppose another reading of that is desired.

There has also been submitted a resolution providing for nominations for President and Vice President by a general referendum of the party. Your committee has not passed upon the subject and has no recommendation to offer. It has drafted an amendment which embodies the idea so that if it is desired by the convention to adopt the principle suggested the committee recommends that it be adopted in the form to be read before you. The committee itself is not opposed to it or favoring it; it is not passing upon it one way or the other. It has decided to submit it to you as a subject worthy of consideration by this body. Comrade Strickland will please read this proposed amendment.

The Secretary then read the proposed Section 9, of Article IX, action on which was taken at the afternoon session, which will be found in the report of that session.

At the conclusion of the reading, Delegate Strickland moved that only such sections of the constitution be read a second time as were requested by the delegates. Adopted.

DEL. GOAZIOU (Pa.): I want to ask whether this was the intention of the committee, as to Section 4, Article 6: It says that the National Committee shall meet at headquarters. Does that mean that the committee shall meet at headquarters in Chicago although the National Convention may meet in some other city? Is it the intention that the National Committee shall go to one city and the National Convention may go to another city. That will be the case unless the National Convention meets where the National headquarters are.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I think the Section may be misinterpreted, and I suggest that we cure it by saying "Except in convention years when it shall meet at the same time and place as the National Convention."

DEL. GOAZIOU: Then you will have to change this.

DEL. HILLQUIT: The wording can be changed to meet that situation.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I move to amend Article 5, Section 1, clause d, by striking out the word "require" and inserting the word "request," so that it will read "such States and Territories as may request interference on the part of the National organization." My motion is to leave that question to the State to say whether they wish such interference on the part of the National organization.

DEL. DUNCAN (Mont.): I move that we first receive notices of desire to amend; that a record of these requests to amend be made by the clerk in the order of the Articles to be amended, and that all these proposed amendments be received before discussion begins, and then be taken up in the order in which they are proposed.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, the Chair will so rule.

DEL. ENDRES (N. Y.): I would like to propose in addition to that, that they be handed in in writing.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, the Chair will rule that we proceed along the line suggested by Comrade Duncan.

A DELEGATE: Do I understand the ruling to be that the Chair will now call for any and all amendments to Article 5, and when we are through with that, for amendments to Article 6, and so on?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will read off simply the numbers, the number of the Article first, and the numbers of the Sections as they follow, and any one having an amendment to present will present it.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED.

ARTICLE V.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I have two amendments to Article V. In Sec. 1, clause (d), strike out the word "require" and insert in place thereof the word "request." In Sec. 12, after the words, "no more than one hundred dollars," insert the words "at one time."

DEL. BURKLE (N. Y.): In Article V, Sec. 12, I move to substitute \$300 for \$100.

DEL. ROSETTE (Md.): I move to add a new section at the end of the article, as follows:

Sec. 13. The National Committee shall publish a monthly bulletin of Socialist information, which shall contain such information as may be of interest to Socialists. The bulletin shall be sold by subscription, and its scope increased in proportion to the income from subscriptions.

The National Committee shall maintain, in connection with the National Bulletin, a Bureau of Information which shall, on request furnish party members such information as they may need in the furtherance of Socialist propaganda.

THE CHAIRMAN: All of this belongs to ARTICLE VII.

DEL. GARVEY: I want information on ART. IX, Sec. 4.

DEL. MERRICK: I move that we take them up in regular order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair, if you recall, tried to rule that we take them up in regular order.

The Chair will now rule that the reading clerk will call off the numbers on the Constitution, and those who have amendments will make them before we go on. ARTICLE V is under consideration.

DEL. MERRICK: I move to amend Sec. 2 of ART. V by striking out the word "five" and inserting the word "seven," so that the National Executive Committee shall be composed of seven members instead of five.

DEL. ZITT (Ohio): I move an addition to Sec. 6, to read as follows: Persons holding elective political positions shall not be eligible to membership on the National Committee, National Executive Committee, employee of the National Office, Organizer, or delegate to the National Convention. This will be Clause 2.

THE CHAIRMAN: That amendment is out of order. It has been acted upon.

DEL. OHOLS (Mass.): I offer as an addition to Sec. 2: All members of the Executive Committee shall make their residences in the city where the National Headquarters are located.

DEL. OYLER (Neb.): I wish to introduce Sec. 13: That the National Committee shall have power to publish a Party newspaper or newspapers.

DEL. GRANT (Minn.): I wish to have inserted in Sec. (e), following the end of the fourth line: A press service that will furnish patent and plate matter for Socialist papers.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): The National Committee shall not publish nor delegate any official organ.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I move to amend Sec. 12 by striking out the words: "No more than one hundred dollars shall be appropriated to any organization other than a subdivision of the party."

ARTICLE VI.

Sec. 1. No amendments.

Sec. 2. Del. Merrick moved to add at the end of Sec. 2: "And a stenographic report of all discussions taking place in the Committee shall be kept for reference by the National Committee."

Sec. 3. No amendment.

Sec. 4. No amendment.

ARTICLE VII.

Sec. 1. Del. Floyd moved to amend Sec. 1 by striking out \$1,500 and substituting \$1,200.

Sec. 2. No amendment.

Sec. 3. No amendment.

ARTICLE VIII.

Sec. 1. Stands.

Sec. 2. Stands.

Sec. 3. Del. Merrick of Pennsylvania moved to strike out the last sentence and insert instead the following: They shall elect a chairman of the group who shall act under instructions of the National Committee on all matters.

DEL. BESSEMER: I wish to amend Sec. 2 by adding: "Or by general referendum of the Party."

ARTICLE IX.

Sec. 1. Del. Zitt moved to amend Art. IX by striking out Sections 1 and 2.

Sec. 2. Del. Barker of Oklahoma moved to amend by inserting the word "majority" before "general vote" in the second line.

Sec. 3. Motion to strike out.

Sec. 4. Del. Kraft, of New Jersey, asked for information from the Committee on the computation of the delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN (HILLQUIT): It shall be composed of 300 delegates, one from each State and Territory, and the remainder in proportion to the average national dues paid. Assume that we have a membership of 200,000. Let us assume that here are 50 organized states. That will take away 50 delegates, at one for each state, and leave 250 to be elected on a basis of one delegate for every 800 members. Let us say the state of New York has 8,000 members, that will mean ten delegates in addition to the one which it gets at large. Then, of course, the question of fractions may come in. There is but one way to offset that, and that is to recognize the largest fractions in number.

Sec. 4. Del. Solomon of New York moved to amend Section 4 by changing the words "two years" in the last line, to "three years."

Del. Zitt moved to add to Section 4, or perhaps make it a new section, the following: Persons holding elective political positions, and all employees of the party with salary attached, shall be ineligible to serve as delegates to National Conventions.

Sec. 5. DEL. BOSTROM of Washington moved to amend Sec. 5 so as to read: Railroad fare, including tourist sleeper. I want that specified, so that delegates may know what to expect.

Sec. 7. DEL. SLOBODIN: I moved to insert in the second sentence of the second paragraph the words "at the time of his nomination." I want to do away with carpenters and shoemakers in the party who haven't done a day's work for twenty years.

Sec. 8 Stands.

ARTICLE X.

Sec. 1. Stands.

Sec. 2. Stands.

Sec. 3. Del. K. Sadler of Washington moved to amend Sec. 3 by adding at the very end the words: To do otherwise will constitute party treason, and result in expulsion from the party.

DEL. DUNCAN moved to amend Sec. 3 by striking out, in the next to the last line on the second paragraph, the words "endorsed or recommended."

DEL. M'FALL of New Hampshire moved to amend Sec. 2 by striking out the last sentence, beginning "When the membership."

Sec. 4. DEL. WELLS of California moved to amend Sec. 4 by adding, after the end of the 6th line, reading "affairs within such state or territory," the words "Provided such propaganda is in harmony with the national platform and declared policy of the Party."

Sec. 5. DEL. SMITH (Mont.): I wish to offer an amendment to Sec. 5, in writing, which I will ask the reading clerk to read.

DEL. WELLS (Wash.): I move to strike out the word "five" and insert the word "three or two," and add "This provision to take effect on January 1, 1913."

DEL. SMITH's amendment to Sec. 5 was read, as follows:

During the months of January and July in each year, or at any other time required by the National Executive Committee or by this Constitution, State Secretaries shall furnish to the National Secretary a list of all locals affiliated with their respective state organizations, together with the number of members in good standing in each local. Refusal, failure or neglect to comply with this section shall subject the state organization to suspension from the Socialist party and deprive such state organization from participating in the affairs of the Socialist party, and shall be a forfeiture of the right of representation in the National Committee, the National Executive or the conventions or congresses of the party.

Sec. 6. DEL. NOBLE of Texas moved to amend Sec. 6 to read two cents instead of five for each member in good standing.

DEL. HOOGERRHYDE of Michigan moved to add Sec. 6: And only due stamps issued by the National Committee and affixed to members' due cards shall be received for payment of said dues.

DEL. BOSTROM moved to strike out the whole section.

Sec. 7. DEL. MERRICK of Pennsylvania moved to strike out the last sentence of the first paragraph, beginning "In cases where husband and wife are both party members—"

DEL. BROWN (Ohio): I move to amend Sec. 7 by adding the words: Also women who are in receipt of income may be allowed to receive exempt due stamps.

DEL. GRANT (Minn.): In the line immediately following "exempt stamps," add "Excepting those issued to wives of comrades."

DEL. WAYNICK (Wash.): In the fifth line after the words "within his control," I wish to insert "Such exempt stamps to bear no designation or mark, distinguishing them from the regular due stamps of the Party."

Sec. 8. DEL. DORFMAN (Ore.): I move to substitute the word "recall" for "imperative mandate."

DEL. PATTERSON (Ohio): A number of the Ohio comrades wish to go on record as moving to strike out the entire Section 7. We want to be so recorded.

Sec. 9. DEL. BENTALL of Illinois desires to amend the close of the first paragraph, making it read as follows: No person shall be nominated or endorsed by any subdivision of the Party, or candidate for public office, unless he is a member of the Party and has been such for at least two consecutive years immediately preceding such nomination.

DEL. KILLINGBECK of New Jersey moved to strike out the last sentence of Sec. 9, beginning "But this provision shall not apply to organizations which have been in existence for less than a year."

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I make an amendment to the amendment, by making it three years instead of one, in the last line.

Sec. 8. DEL. GARVER of Missouri moved to add to Sec. 8: "Failure to do so shall give the National Party jurisdiction."

DEL. ZITT moved to have the word "one" in the fourth line, where it says "at least one year," substituted by three.

DEL. ALEXANDER of Texas moved to substitute for "one year," in the last line, "five consecutive years."

Sec. 8.

DEL. GARVER moved to strike it out. DEL. TUCK (Cal.): I would like to incorporate as Article X, Section 11, the following: "Branches may be organized to accommodate night workers, to be known as daylight branches."

DEL. BESSEMER: I wish to add a Section 11 to Article X: "State Secretaries shall report to the National Office every three months, the name and addresses of all local Secretaries in the state, together with the number of members in good standing in each."

ARTICLE XI.

Sec. 1. No amendment.

ARTICLE XII.

DEL. PREVEY of Ohio moves to amend by striking out "15,000 members" and inserting "20,000."

DEL. BOSTROM moves to amend the amendment by making it read "30,000" instead of 15,000.

Amendment to strike out the words "And a per diem equal to the per diem fixed for national organizers and lecturers," at the top of page 14.

ARTICLE XIII.

DEL. BOSTROM of Washington moved to strike out the whole of Article XIII.

Sec. 1. Stands.
Sec. 2. Stands.
Sec. 3. Stands.
Sec. 4. Stands.

ARTICLE XIV.

Sec. 1. Stands.

ARTICLE XV.

Sec. 1. DEL. ZITT moved to amend by striking out the words "National Committee in session" in the two places where it occurs, in Sec. 1.

Sec. 2. Stands.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I want to offer a new section, Section 3, at the end of Article XV: "Referendums to evoke or amend a provision of this Constitution may be instituted only one year after the adoption of said provision."

ARTICLE XVI.

Sec. 1. Stands.
Sec. 2. Stands.

MINORITY REPORT.

Substitute for Article V, Section 8.

Sec. 8. No amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Under the motion which was adopted we have less than twenty minutes to discuss and adopt these amendments.

A DELEGATE: I move that these amendments be taken up and adopted or rejected without discussion.

The Indiana delegation handed in a new section for Article XVI that the National organization copyright the emblem.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): If this is the time to do it, I want to move that the National emblem shall be the arm and the torch.

THE CHAIRMAN: Unless the amendment is properly and offered as a part of the Constitution, I shall have to rule it out of order.

DEL. BESSEMER moved to adjourn until 1:30.

THE CHAIRMAN: To do that, we would have to suspend the rules.

Motion was made to suspend the rules, and another motion to table the motion to suspend the rules, which was put and declared carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now proceed to take up the amendments serially and vote upon them.

THE SECRETARY: Under Article V, Section 12, the first amendment I have is by Burke of New York to substitute \$300 in place of one hundred.

The motion was put and declared lost.

Clifford of Ohio offers an amendment to Article V, Section 12, by cutting out the sentence beginning: "No more than one hundred dollars" to the end of the section.

Motion duly put, and defeated.

Amendment to Article V, Section 2, by Del. Merrick, by striking out five and inserting seven, was put and declared lost.

Amendment of Ohsol, to Section 2, was put, and declared lost.

Amendment of Grant, to Section 6, defeated.

Amendment of Grant in regard to maintaining a press service that will furnish plate and patent matter to Socialist papers, was put and declared carried.

THE SECRETARY: There are two new sections proposed, to be known as Section 13. Both being in regard to Party Press, upon motion, duly seconded, action upon them was deferred until we have the report of the Committee on Press.

The Minority Report on the amendment to Section 8 of Article V was put and declared lost. Division was called for, and the Minority Report was defeated by a vote of 98 to 118.

The Secretary read the amendment offered by Del. Slobodin of New York, to Section 12, of Article V, that to insert the words "at one session" after the words "one hundred dollars." The amendment was lost.

The Secretary next read an amendment offered by Del. Slobodin to amend Paragraph (d), of Section 1, of Article V, by striking out the word "require" and inserting the word "request."

Amendment lost.

The convention then proceeded to consider Article VI.

The Secretary read an amendment to Section 2, offered by Del. Merrick of Pennsylvania, to add to the Section the following: "A stenographic report of all discussions taking place in the Committee shall be kept for the information of the National Committee."

The amendment was adopted by a vote of 94 to 93.

Article VII was next taken up and considered.

The Secretary read an amendment to Section 1, offered by Del. Downing of California, to strike out "\$1,500" and insert "\$1,200."

The amendment was lost.

Del. Rosette of Maryland moved to add a new section to be known as Section 4, as follows: "The Executive Secretary shall publish a monthly bulletin of Socialist information, which shall contain such information on industrial, civic, historical and other matters as may be of interest to Socialists. The Bulletin shall be sold by subscription, and its scope increased in proportion to the income from subscriptions. The Executive Secretary shall maintain, in connection with the Bulletin, a bureau of information which shall, on request, furnish party members such information as they may need in the furtherance of Socialist propaganda."

On motion of Del. O'Reilly of Illinois the amendment was deferred until the Press Committee should report.

Amendments to Article VIII were then taken up. The Secretary read an amendment offered by Del. Merrick of Pennsylvania, to strike out the last sentence of Section 3, beginning "They shall elect a chairman of the group," etc., and to insert "they shall elect a chairman of the group, and shall act under instructions given by the National Committee on all matters."

Amendment lost.

The Secretary next read an amendment to Section 2, offered by Del. Bessemer of Ohio, that the section be made to read as follows: "They shall carry out instructions, which may be given to them by National Conventions, by the National Committee in session, or by a general referendum vote of the party."

The amendment was adopted.

Article IX was next taken up.

Del. Zitt (Ohio) offered an amendment to strike out Section 1 and Section 3, both of which provide for the holding of National Conventions.

Amendment lost.

An amendment was offered by Del. Parker (Okla.), as follows: In Section 2 insert "majority" before "general," so that it will read, "at any time if decided upon by a majority general vote."

The amendment was lost.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.) offered an amendment to Section 4, to strike out "two" and insert "three," so that the last clause of the section should read, "and shall have been a member of the party organization at least three years."

The amendment was adopted.

Del. Zitt of Ohio offered the following addition to Section 4: "Persons holding elective political positions, and all salaried employees of the party, shall be ineligible to serve as delegates to National Conventions."

Amendment lost.

Section 5, of Article IX, as originally reported by the committee, was read.

DEL. HILLQUIT: That was corrected by the committee to read, "Railroad fare of delegates going to and coming from the conventions of the party, and the per diem allowance of \$2.50 to cover expenses," etc.

DEL. BOSTROM (Wash.) moved to amend by adding after "railroad fare" the words "including tourist sleeper car fare."

DEL. KILLINGBECK (N. J.) moved to lay the amendment on the table.

At the request of Del. Kate Sadler of Washington, the Chairman explained the difference between tourist sleepers and regular Pullman sleepers.

The amendment was then adopted. A motion was carried to continue in session until the report of the Committee on Constitution was finished, and then to adjourn for one hour.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.) offered the following amendment to Section 7 of Article IX: That the second sentence be changed so as to read "Such list shall contain the occupation of each delegate at the time of his nomination."

Amendment adopted.

DEL. BESSEMER (Ohio) moved to strike out the first eight lines of the second paragraph, being that portion beginning "The Executive Secretary" and ending "and furnished to the party press for publication."

Amendment lost.

The Secretary read the following section, formulated by the Committee on Constitution as Section 9 of Article IX, a new section not in the printed report of the committee:

Sec. 9. On the first day of November in each year preceding a presidential election, the national office shall issue a call for nominations for candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States, and each local shall be entitled to nominate one candidate for each office. Thirty days shall be allowed for nominations, and fifteen days for acceptances and declinations by candidates who have received at least five nominations. The names of candidates having received five or more nominations and having accepted the same shall immediately be published for seconds, each local being entitled to second the nomination of one candidate for President and one for Vice-President. All candidates receiving at least 50 seconds to the nomination, including the nominations each may have received in the first instance, shall be placed on the referendum ballot. The referendum shall be submitted on February 1st. Fifty days shall be allowed for the referendum. The candidate receiving a majority of all the votes cast shall be the nominee. In case no candidate receives the majority, a second referendum shall be held, upon the ballot for which shall appear the names of all candidates receiving as high as ten per cent of the vote cast in the preceding referendum. The second referendum shall be submitted fifteen days after the close of the first referendum, and shall be closed in fifty days from the date of submission. In case no candidate receives a majority of all the votes cast in the second referendum the names of the two highest shall be placed on the ballot for a third referendum, which shall be submitted fifteen days after the close of the second, and such third referendum shall close fifty days from the date of submission. The candidates thus nominated shall be the nominees of the Socialist party, and their names shall be placed upon the ballots in presidential primary elections in all states where such primary elections are mandatory. No member of the party shall allow his name to be placed on such primary ballots if he is not the regular nominee of the party. All candidates for Presidential or Vice-Presidential nomination by the Socialist party shall possess the qualifications required by the Constitution of the United States for President and Vice-President, and in addition thereto shall have been members of the party at least eight years.

DEL. TAYLOR (Ill.): A point of information. I wish to ask the chairman of this

committee, if in figuring the time for this referendum, he has considered that the Presidential primary in certain states occurs the first Tuesday after the first Monday in April, and if this method will give time enough.

DEL. DUNCAN: It will not give time enough, because it takes six months.

DEL. ENDRES (N. Y.): I have an amendment to offer.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will have to rule that you cannot make an amendment and cannot discuss it.

DEL. ENDRES: I object to that ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN: No amendments are in order.

DEL. DUNCAN: What is the reason?

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): I move to recommit this to the committee. (Seconded.)

DEL. HILLQUIT: This is not a committee report. The committee has merely phrased it and formulated certain propositions made by delegates. The committee does not stand for it, and there is no reason and no sense in referring it back to the committee.

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): I move that we place this amendment in the hands of the committee for revision and report. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is in order if the mover insists.

DEL. BARNES (Pa.): I move that we refer it to the new National Committee for favorable consideration so far as the principle is concerned. (Seconded.)

DEL. HILLQUIT: I move to amend by striking out the word "favorable." Let it be referred for consideration to the incoming National Executive Committee. (Seconded.)

The amendment was lost, and the original motion was then carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried, to refer it to the new National Committee, which will meet some time next year, on or about the first of June.

The convention then proceeded to the consideration of Article X.

DEL. KATE SADLER (Wash.) offered the following amendment: To add at the end of Section 3 the following words: "To do otherwise will constitute party treason and will result in expulsion from the party."

The question was put on the amendment, and it was declared lost. A second vote was taken, and the amendment was adopted.

Section 4 was read.

DEL. WELLS (Cal.) offered an amendment to add the following words to the section: "Provided such propaganda is in harmony with the national platform and declared policy."

Amendment adopted.

Section 5 was next read.

DEL. SMITH (Mont.) moved to amend by adding the following to the section: "During the months of January and July of each year, or at any other time required by the National Executive Committee or by this constitution, the State Secretaries shall furnish the National Secretary a list of all locals affiliated with their respective state organizations, together with the number of members in good standing, and the name and address of the corresponding secretary of each local. Refusal, failure or neglect to comply with this section shall subject the state organization to suspension from the Socialist party and deprive such state organization of participation in the affairs of the Socialist party, and shall be a forfeiture of the right to representation in the National Committee, the Na-

tional Executive Committee, the conventions and congresses of the party."

Amendment adopted.

Section 6 read by the Secretary.

DEL. HOOGERHYDE (Mich.) moved to amend by adding the following: "And only dues stamps issued by the National Committee shall be affixed to members' dues cards as valid receipts for the payment of dues."

Amendment adopted.

DEL. WELLS (Wash.) moved to amend Section 5 by striking out "five cents" and inserting "three cents," and to add the following to the section: "To take effect January 1, 1913."

Amendment lost.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.) moved to amend the same section by substituting "two cents" for "five cents."

Amendment lost.

Section 7 was read.

DEL. BESSEMER (Ohio) moved to strike out the entire section.

Amendment lost.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.) moved to strike out the last sentence in the second paragraph, referring to exemption stamps to be used by husband or wife.

Amendment lost.

DEL. BROWN (Iowa) moved to add the following to the section: "Also women who are not in receipt of incomes may be allowed to receive the special exempt stamps."

Amendment lost.

DEL. GRANT (Minn.) moved an amendment that immediately following the words "exempt stamps" in the eighth line of the first paragraph the following words be added: "Excepting those issued to the wives of comrades."

Amendment lost.

DEL. WAYNICK (Wash.) moved that after the word "control" in the fifth line of the first paragraph of Section 7, the following be inserted: "Such exempt stamps or bear no designation or marks distinguishing them from the regular dues stamps of the party."

Amendment lost.

Section 8 was read.

DEL. DOREMAN (Ore.) moved to substitute "recall" for "imperative mandate."

Amendment lost.

DEL. GARVER (Mo.) moved the following addition: "Failure to do so shall give the national party jurisdiction."

Amendment lost.

Section 9 was read.

DEL. BENTALL (Ill.) moved to amend by striking out "one" and inserting "two."

Amendment adopted.

DEL. KILLINGBECK (N. J.) moved to strike out the last sentence, reading "But this provision shall not apply to organizations which have been in existence for less than one year."

Amendment lost.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.) moved to amend by making the time three years.

Amendment lost.

DEL. ALEXANDER (Tex.) moved to make the time five years.

Amendment lost.

Section 10 was read.

DEL. GARVER (Mo.) moved to strike out the section altogether.

Amendment lost.

DEL. TUCK (Cal.) moved to add the following new section: "Branches may be organized to accommodate night workers, such branches to be known as daylight branches."

Amendment lost.

DEL. BESSEMER (Ohio) moved the addition of a new section to be known as Section 11, as follows: "State Secretaries shall report to the national office every three months the names and addresses of all members in good standing in each."

Amendment lost.

Article XII was read.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.) moved to strike, after the word "delegates," the words "and a per diem equal to the per diem fixed for national organizers and lecturers."

Amendment lost.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio) moved to strike out "fifteen thousand" and insert "twenty thousand members."

Amendment adopted.

DEL. BESSEMER (Ohio) moved to make the number "thirty thousand" instead of "fifteen thousand."

Amendment lost.

Article XIII was read.

An amendment was offered to strike out the entire article.

DEL. MALEY (Wash.) moved to defer action till after the report of the Woman's National Committee is received.

Motion to defer lost.

A vote was taken on the amendment, and it was defeated.

Article XIV was read.

DEL. ZITT (Ohio) moved to strike out all reference to the National Committee in session, where it occurs.

Amendment lost.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.) offered the following as an addition to the article, to be known as Section 3: "Referendums to revoke or amend the provisions of this Constitution may be instituted only one year after the adoption of such provisions."

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Chairman Goebel called the convention to order at 2:45 p. m.

CONSTITUTION.

DEL. KATE SADLER: At the preceding session I offered a new section to be added to the Constitution, but it was not acted on. It was just an omission, that is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection we will put it to a vote. The Constitution has been adopted as a whole. Is there any objection to reading this section? There is none, and we will read it and put it to a vote now.

The Secretary read the following: A new section to be added to the Constitution, offered by Del. Kate Sadler of Washington: "That the National Executive Committee shall print a specific statement in the Bulletin of all moneys expended for printing leaflets and books, and the names of the same and their authors."

The amendment was adopted.

DEL. ZITT (Ohio): I rise to a point of information. I would like to know if the old Constitution will be submitted to referendum along with the new.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it will not.

The Secretary read an amendment offered by Del. Meitzen of Texas, providing that members of the National Committee shall not hold office for more than two consecutive terms.

The amendment was lost.

Amendment adopted.

Article XVI. The Indiana delegation submitted a new section, to be known as Section 3, as follows: "In order to prevent the misuse of the party name by parties calling themselves Socialists, but who are not members of the party, the name 'Socialist Party of the United States' shall be copyrighted."

Amendment lost.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.) moved the addition of the following new section: "The national emblem of the party shall be the arm and torch."

Amendment lost.

DEL. McFALL (N. Y.) moved to strike out the last sentence in Section 2 of Article X, which provides for revoking the charter of a state when the membership falls below 150 per month for any six consecutive months.

Amendment lost.

DEL. STRICKLAND (Ohio) then moved the adoption of the Constitution as a whole, with the exception of the points deferred. (Seconded.)

The motion was carried, and the Constitution was adopted as a whole, with the exception of the points deferred.

DEL. SPARGO moved to change the order of the day and take up the report of the Committee on Immigration this afternoon.

The Chairman held that the motion could not be entertained, under the rules.

TELEGRAM FROM COMRADE DEBS.

The Secretary read a telegram from Comrade Eugene V. Debs, accepting the nomination for President.

The convention then, at 1:45 p. m., adjourned for one hour.

COMPENSATION.

DEL. WHITE (Mass.) moved that the Secretary and Assistant Secretaries be remunerated at the rate of \$4.00 per diem for the days of the convention.

The motion was seconded and carried. On motion of Del. Patterson (Ohio), the sergeants-at-arms were included in the same motion.

REPORT OF WOMAN'S COMMITTEE.

DEL. LOWE (Ill.), of the Woman's National Committee, made the following report on behalf of the committee:

DEL. LOWE: Our report this afternoon will be made just as brief as possible, and I think it will arouse no discussion and in that way we can dispose of this in just a few minutes, I believe. I want to say first that I shall report to you the work that we have accomplished during the past two years, the result of the work of the Woman's Committee. Comrade May Wood Simons will present to you the recommendations for the coming year. We believe that it is necessary that the delegates to this convention carry home with them some report of the work that we have done, and it has been proved to us that that is necessary because of the motions made by our comrade from Washington this morning. When I asked him whether or not he had read the report which has been in your hands since last Sunday, he admitted he had not, and I will venture to say that many of you have not. He said to me, "I don't believe in this

aggregation of women." I said, "Neither do we. That is the thing we are fighting. The thing that we want is getting the women right into the Socialist party locals side by side with the men." (Applause.) We do not want separate organizations of women. The Socialist party would have no more control over separate organizations of women than it would have over separate organizations of men, none whatever. We simply want to have the women members of your locals elected by you to a woman's committee, whose special duty it is to carry on the propaganda work, the educational work among the wives and the daughters of the members of the locals, and the women who are sympathizers and interested in the movement. That is the purpose of our organization; and, working along those lines, on broad general plans, during the latter part of 1910 and 1911, we have accomplished this, and I shall read this to you.*

RECOMMENDATIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vice-Chairman Comrade Simons will now read the recommendations of the National Woman's Committee.

DEL. MAY WOOD SIMONS: The National Woman's Committee wishes to put these recommendations before you for your consideration. Two years ago, when the national conference was held, various women in various parts of the country were appointed by the National Woman's Committee to make a special study of various phases of propaganda as it affects women, and these women have, with only one exception, reported to the National Woman's Committee, and it is their recommendations as finally worked over by the National Woman's Committee that are being presented to you today. Our first recommendation is upon the propaganda among housewives:

RECOMMENDATION ON PROPAGANDA AMONG HOUSEWIVES.

The committee recognizes: 1. The necessity of bringing the message of Socialism to the housewives of the nation. 2. That the first duty of the housewife, while her children are young, is toward these children, her husband and her home. 3. That owing to this fact, agitation is particularly difficult because housewives who are tied to their homes cannot go to meetings and do not even care to do so.

Therefore, the committee recognizes that these housewives can be reached chiefly by means of literature, which must be simple and short, and prove to the housewife that the salvation of her family lies in the direction of Socialism; and

The committee recommends that literature appealing to the housewife should take the home as the starting point and prove that capitalism destroys the home, and that Socialism will rebuild the same on a more substantial basis by making both men and women economically independent.

The committee finally suggests that the literary propaganda be supplemented by individual work by Socialist men and women in the homes and in social gatherings of non-Socialist women, especially of the women of the working class.

RECOMMENDATION ON PROPAGANDA AMONG FARMERS' WIVES.

In view of the fact that the woman on the farm is the most isolated of any so-

cial group, she is less conscious of her social interdependence.

We recommend that all literature circulated in this group be of such nature as to point out clearly the exploitation of her individual industry and the rapid centralization of the farm and its products into the hands of a few.

We further recommend that a systematic canvass be made for the names of farmers' wives and that this list be used in the systematic distribution of such literature as will appeal to her.

RECOMMENDATION ON WORK AMONG FOREIGN SPEAKING WOMEN.

Women of the working class who come to our shores from other countries may be classified into two general divisions: Socialists and Non-Socialists.

This naturally divides the work of this department into two general heads:

1. Work among foreign speaking women who are already Socialists. This work consists in educating and informing them as to our political methods and the importance of Suffrage for Woman. The propaganda for woman's ballot will not only be helpful to women, but it will also inspire the women to urge their men relatives to become citizens as soon as possible.

Plan of Work:

We recommend a leaflet explaining the ballot as a factor in securing political power for the working class, and the importance of the right of suffrage and the necessity of taking an active part in the campaigns for the extension of franchised rights.

2. That we request all translators to give out all our plans of work and suggestions to the locals and branches, and as far as possible translate our leaflets.

3. That they in turn give us an English translation of all plans and methods employed in their work among women.

WORK AMONG NON-SOCIALIST FOREIGN SPEAKING WOMEN.

The foreign speaking woman must be reached with our propaganda. This is important, not only for her own sake, but because of the influence she exerts in her own home.

Plan of Work:—

1. We recommend a series of articles explaining why the foreigner does not find the opportunity and liberty in this country he had anticipated, and show how the workers have the same struggle in the United States as in other countries.

2. We recommend the publication of the list of foreign leaflets and periodicals and where they may be obtained, so our English speaking women may know where and what they can get to distribute among the foreign speaking women.

3. We recommend the distribution of leaflets dealing with the conditions the foreigner will find in this country and giving information concerning the Socialist party and its work in foreign ports. This will necessitate the co-operation with our comrades in other lands, and give us some definite work in establishing a closer international bond of activity.

4. We recommend that special effort be made to organize the foreign speaking women on the economic field where they are employed in the industrial world, and

*The Report is printed in full in Appendix I.

that all leaflets printed in English on this subject relative to the importance of women organizing in unions, be translated and distributed among the people where they are needed.

DEL. SIMONS: The next recommendation is on the Teachers' Section. The reason we have brought this in is because so far the work of the Teachers' Bureau has been handled by the National office. The recommendation is as follows:

RECOMMENDATION.

On Establishment of Municipal Bureau. (Teachers.)

There is a rapidly growing demand upon the part of the newly elected officials for information upon the municipal problems that confront them. At the present time there is no provision in the National Office for supplying this demand. The present Teachers' Bureau, which has been in existence eight months, is attempting to answer but one of the municipal problems which our officials must face.

We believe that this department in the National Office should be enlarged into a Municipal Bureau, having for its purpose the securing of information upon all municipal problems.

We therefore recommend that this be done.

DEL. SIMONS: Our next recommendation is on the question of the suffrage, and I consider that to some extent this is one of the most important recommendations we have to make before you today. I am at present living in the state of Kansas. This fall we shall have the question of the suffrage before the people of the state of Kansas, and there is little doubt that it will be granted, and that full suffrage will belong to women in that state. The same question is coming before other states, and I consider it of great importance, because my own personal experience has been, in these towns in Kansas where women already have the municipal ballot, that the women need a great deal of education. There is no doubt that women will have the ballot in a very short time. It is also important because we have not up to this time sufficiently extended our propaganda among women. We find that the ballot will be given to women, and then we will have a very large task to educate them in the use of the ballot. This is our recommendation:

"Whereas, Woman suffrage amendments will be submitted to the voters in Wisconsin, Michigan, Kansas, Oregon and Ohio, we earnestly urge upon the membership in these states the importance of making this a leading issue in this campaign. All speakers, literature agents, organizers, canvassers, watchers and workers of all kinds should be instructed to give this measure their especial attention." (Applause.)

I want to say that I cannot tell you how serious I think this is, because we have just closed a campaign in the town in which I live, in which campaign the Socialists were defeated because of the fact that we had not sufficiently educated the women how to use their ballots. I believe that at this time this convention should wake up to the fact that we are going to have the vote very soon, and your propaganda work among women must be carried on with the greatest energy. (Applause.)

The last recommendation of the Committee is on the subject of White Slavery:

Whereas, The houses of infamy which are protected by the capitalist governments of the cities of the United States are not only destructive of the physical health and moral conscience of the people, but are the means of a most shameful slavery for young girls as well; and

Whereas, It has been shown by official investigation that large numbers of young girls are taken into those places by lures, tricks, frauds and even by force. That the hunting, deluding, entrapping and capturing of working girls, solely for inmates of segregated districts of vice, has become a regular established business followed by large numbers of men in the country. That while such business is forbidden by law, it is protected by the officials who, for the protection, share the profits. That while capitalist officials boast of standing for "law and order" and for making all things constitutional, they, at the same time, establish those districts where not only statutory law and the conscience of the land is broken, but every noble impulse of the human conscience is violated; and

Whereas, The attempted hygienic value of such segregation and regulation has been shown a failure, the highest medical authorities here and in Europe are condemning it in unstinted terms (As Dr. Prince A. Morrow of New York; Drs. Lesser, Neisser and Blascho of Germany; Drs. Mauriac and Fournier of France, and the highest medical authorities of England and the Scandinavian countries); and

Whereas, It is distinctively class question, as working girls form 99 per cent of the victims, and as the "segregating" consists in appointing an area in the very poorest districts of the city where the evil may go on with official help for keepers and procurers, thus becoming a constant menace to the poor who must live in such districts: their children, girls and boys alike early falling victims to this worst of capitalist protected vices; and

Whereas, The men engaged in this traffic combine with big business for protection, and big business protects them in turn for the votes fraudulent and otherwise that they give to the machine. Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates of the National Socialist Party of America, in convention assembled, do hereby proclaim our unremitting hostility to such institutions; that we urge our members in all the cities of the land to make insistent and urgent protest against such segregation and despoliation of helpless womanhood; that we demand the enforcement of law; and further be it

Resolved, That where Socialist administrations be elected in cities they immediately abolish such districts, extend care and protection to the unhappy women inmates, and prosecute vigorously all keepers, procurers and others engaged in this most infamous business; and further be it

Resolved, That we use our power to secure legislation requiring physicians to report all cases of venereal diseases, and that a public record be kept of the same; and also make it a felony for any person not a regularly licensed physician, to treat such diseases.

Resolved, That while we recognize that prostitution is a by-product of capitalism, we recommend this measure as one which will hamper the cadet in his right to take profits from the unfortunate woman, and to show our contempt for the miserable substitute for a home offered by the masters to our workmen; and we further

Recommend, That to the end that our boys and girls may be better able to protect themselves, instruction in sex hygiene be carefully given in all public schools.

The reading of the recommendations was received with great applause.

DEL. SIMONS: I move that these recommendations be accepted by the convention. (Seconded.)

DEL. MALKIEL (N. Y.): I move that they be taken up and discussed seriatim, because there are a number of things that have to be discussed. (Seconded.)

DEL. LONDON (N. Y.): I move as an amendment that the recommendations of the Woman's Committee be referred to the National Executive Committee. If that motion is seconded I will explain why I make that motion.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): A point of order. There is a motion made and properly before the house, and this amendment has no relation whatever to the proposition before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would rule the motion out of order at this time. The amendment is before us.

DEL. LONDON: Is the motion to refer out of order?

THE CHAIRMAN: To the National Executive Committee, yes. I believe this report is before the convention and should be acted on.

DEL. LONDON: It is an amendment to the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment to the amendment is in order.

DEL. LONDON: That is what I made, an amendment to the amendment, in the nature of an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: You made a motion to refer. That is not an amendment.

DEL. LONDON: Then I make it as a substitute.

THE CHAIRMAN: Substitutes have been ruled out of order under Robert's Rules of Order by this convention.

DEL. LONDON: Not at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us understand the status of things. We have had the report of the Woman's Committee. The Secretary will please state just how the things stand.

SEC. REILLY: The motion is that the report and recommendations of the committee be adopted. Amendment by Malkiel of New York, to take up the recommendations seriatim.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

DEL. MALKIEL: I am speaking for the amendment. You are getting ready to go home, but don't forget that this matter is more important and of greater significance than a good many if not most of the matters you have voted on up till now. You don't realize it. The woman's question is the greatest question that confronts the Socialist party. Within four or five years the United States will enfranchise women in every single state. For the present it is the greatest question before the Socialist movement in this country, and if you do not realize it now you will later on when it will be entirely too late. I appeal to you, before you go, to give this consideration. There are a number of recommendations made there. They are not made just for the purpose of coming here and presenting them to you. They are made for the purpose of your serious discussion and consideration. There are a good many other points that will be up today before you, among them the immigration question, which faces you

after this report is disposed of. We are sending missionaries to China, while we are leaving women in ignorance at home. You have in your midst six million women who have neither fathers nor husbands nor brothers to shape their ideas and their views, and the minute they get a vote they will use it against the Socialist party. Therefore, I say to you, consider them before you decide not to take up this report seriatim and to vote it down.

DEL. SIMONS: These recommendations represent the work during the past few years of women from all over the country who are not present at this convention. We drew the report up in as brief form as we possibly could. I am now speaking for the Woman's Committee. We are perfectly satisfied, if you so desire, that you vote for this report as a whole, and we do not ask you to take it up seriatim. For my part, I think we have touched upon every phase of the question that we possibly can. We have tried to make it short and concise so that these recommendations can be carried out. For my part, I am speaking for the committee against taking this up and considering each item. We are perfectly satisfied if you take it as it stands. (Applause.)

DEL. LONDON: A point of order. I want a ruling from the Chairman before we vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point?

DEL. LONDON: My point of order is that in the report submitted by the Woman's Committee there are recommendations which involve things contradictory to the resolutions adopted by this convention, and I want it understood and want an intelligent vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair must decide that you are making a speech under the guise of a point of order.

DEL. LONDON: One moment. I want a ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN: My ruling is that you are not in order at this time with your point of order.

DEL. LONDON: I ask you for a ruling. Permit me to state my question and ask you for a ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN: If Comrade London will give the Chair a chance—

DEL. LONDON: Will you please give me a chance?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will give you a chance.

DEL. LONDON: I want to ask a question, and you do not permit me to ask it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now—

DEL. LONDON: I appeal from your decision. I will not be gagged or humbugged. I appeal from your decision.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the appeal seconded?

The appeal was seconded, and Vice-Chairman Edwards took the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: State the ground of your appeal.

DEL. LONDON: I am anxious to get away from here. It is a sacrifice to me to stay away from a busy man's office, and I do not want to waste time. I do not want this convention to make a mistake when we are all worn out and tired and hungry and ready to go. There are things here which may involve a contradiction of the action that we have taken. Therefore, I wanted to get this straight. I wanted to ask the Chairman this question: Will the adoption of the report of the Woman's Committee mean that we have repealed the resolutions which we have heretofore adopted, or will it mean the adoption of only such parts

of the recommendation as will not contradict the resolutions previously adopted? Is that a sensible question to ask? That is a sensible question to ask. Even a Chairman coming from New Jersey should have sense enough to permit such a question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Del. Goebel): The Chairman is perfectly satisfied, no matter how you vote on the appeal. I am here on the last day, knowing that we have got business enough to take ten hours. Now, many delegates must leave by six. I am trying to express the will of the house. I believe it is the sentiment of the house to do business quickly. Comrade London and others have a line of action along other lines contrary to this sentiment, and therefore I knew I was not unfair in making the ruling I did. I am satisfied, no matter how you vote on the appeal.

A vote was taken and the Chair was sustained. Del. Goebel then resumed the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: The matter before the house, in order that you may understand what you are voting on, will now be read by the Secretary.

SEC. REILLY: Motion that the recommendations be adopted. Amendment offered by Malkiel of New York to take up the recommendations seriatim.

DEL. LONDON: A question of information before we vote. I want to vote intelligently. I want information before I vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be that the delegate from New York needs information.

DEL. LONDON: I do need it, and you need a great deal of it too. I ask this question, Comrade Chairman: I am ready to vote for the adoption of the Woman's report. Will the adoption of the report of the Woman's Committee mean the repeal of such resolutions previously adopted as contradict the recommendations of the Woman's Committee? Will you please answer that question?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that nothing which has already been acted upon and adopted could be changed in any way without a motion to reconsider. Therefore nothing could be adopted at this time that conflicts with anything already done, without such a motion to reconsider. The amendment to take up the recommendations seriatim was then lost.

The motion to refer to the National Executive Committee was lost.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I move to insert after the words "a large number of men," the words "and women." (Seconded.)

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I rise to a point of order. The previous question had been ordered, and this amendment and debate are out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is a little in doubt as to whether the previous question did cover this. The matter before the house is the motion to adopt as a whole, as I understand it. Comrade Slobodin offers an amendment. Is that true? I think Comrade Slobodin is in order, but I hope no one will take advantage of this ruling any more than can be helped.

DEL. MALKIEL: I want to move as an amendment that the resolution on White Slavery be read over once more.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, the Secretary will read it.

DEL. THOMPSON: I move the previous question.

Seconded and carried.

SEC. REILLY: The amendment by Slobodin of New York is to add to the

words "a large number of men," the words "and women." I don't know just where it comes in, but that is the way it was given.

The amendment was carried, and the amended motion to adopt the report as a whole was then carried.

DEL. LOWE (Ill.): May I say a word on behalf of the Committee? Comrade Meyer London explained to us that he feared there was something in our recommendations that might contradict some action on something that was already passed. He says he has read it carefully since and that there is not.

RULES OF ORDER.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): Has the report of the Committee been disposed of?

THE CHAIRMAN: It has.

DEL. LEE: Then there is no motion before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. LEE: I then move a special rule, and I understand that it will take a two-thirds vote to carry this rule. I desire to move a rule and to say a few words in support of it. I move that no action taken by the convention up to this time be hereafter reconsidered by the convention, unless by the vote of a majority of the whole number of delegates entitled to seats in the convention. (Seconded.) I do not know with what truth, but it has been said this afternoon, and I have heard it from various quarters, that there would be an attempt to reconsider Section 6 of Article II of the Constitution, which was adopted yesterday by a roll call vote of 191 to 90.

If I remember right. We know very well that under gag law it might be done. We know very well that some delegates will have to go home. We know very well that the longer the convention goes on and the longer we stay the greater the danger of its action being unrepresentative. I want to say that if there is no intention to take such advantage at such an hour, then the comrades will not oppose this. The rules will work no injustice. The rules will do nothing but to maintain the well-considered and recorded sentiments of this convention and to prevent any injudicious or ill-advised comrade from precipitating a scandal in the last days of the convention which would give the laugh to the telegram from our presidential candidate that we so heartily applauded this morning.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let the Secretary read the motion.

SEC. REILLY: "Motion by Lee of New York, that no action taken by the convention up to this time be hereafter reconsidered by the convention unless by a vote of a majority of the whole number of delegates entitled to seats in the convention."

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair wants to say this. The Chair is going to make a statement.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I would just like to make a statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me make my statement. I want to make a suggestion. This is what I started to say: Comrade Lee has been, like myself, on one side of this question. He has spoken for that side. I think they want fair play as much as I want it.

DEL. WHEELER: I just want to make this statement on this matter. Now all has been said and done, and there is absolutely no person on this side objecting in any particular to what has been done. There is no person on this side endeavoring to go

about and try to reconsider. We do not want to do such a thing. (Applause.) Speaking of tricks, we do not have to use tricks. We are perfectly satisfied with the action you took yesterday. I am sure you will agree, when you have had time to consider it, that, considering the stand we have consistently taken in this convention and before we came to this convention, that we could not have acted in any other manner than we acted when we voted against that section. We having been in the minority and being thus placed on record, we have no purpose in seeking a reconsideration. What some other comrades are fearing has something to do with another proposition, and not with this convention. I want to say for the younger element of those representing us here, that although you may not believe it now, we acted in perfect good faith, and we have the interests of this party at stake as well as any men with white hair. (Applause.) I want to say furthermore, and I am not saying it with bitterness, nor am I saying it with a feeling of desire to get back at anybody—I hope I am beyond any such thing as that—I want to say this, that as the comrade back there said, there is no use denying things; it has been mentioned around here; it has been spoken on the platform; that there might be a trick. Now, we never had such a thing in our minds. (Applause.) And when we go from here we will put every ounce of energy we have into the campaign as well as you. (Applause.) I am sure my Comrade Lee—and I would say that I am not putting any soft soap on him—I have known him a long time and I admire the work he has done—I am sure my good Comrade Lee will now consider that some of his remarks were not to the point. We represent this side of the proposition. You will all agree that we have a perfect right to our opinion, and I am sure you would have no respect for us if we had not done what we did yesterday; and now, if we tried some petty scheme for the purpose of getting a momentary advantage, you might have some cause for discontent, but we are not going to do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: No; we are going out of here united. That is what it means.

DEL. WHEELER: If you feel the same way, we are going from here united.

The previous question was ordered, and the motion of Del. Lee was carried.

CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Hillquit has a supplementary report from the Committee on Constitution. There is nothing in order but Comrade Hillquit at this time.

DEL. HILLQUIT: This report, Comrades, does not deal directly with the Constitution. The Constitution deals with our permanent form of organization. The supplementary report which we submit now deals with a temporary condition. That is the reason we make it separate. It bears upon the campaign before us. The Committee on Constitution finds that the plan of organization submitted by the Committee and adopted by you will not enter into force until after the campaign. Meanwhile we will have the largest and I hope, most effective campaign before us that we have ever had, with practically no National Executive Committee to conduct it unless our committee might make it possible to meet once or at most twice before the election. That certainly will be entirely insufficient for the purpose of planning and carrying out the details of a campaign of the magnitude anticipated by us. We therefore recommend that this convention elect a

special Campaign Committee of five, selecting persons from such localities as will make it convenient for them to meet often, say about once a month to start with, and once every two weeks, and if need be once a week, during the close of the campaign.

We also and particularly recommend to you the election of a Campaign Manager, for the reason that the regular business of the National office is such today that it takes every moment of the present office force and the present Secretary, and if we desire to carry on a vigorous campaign, we must have a special working department for that purpose. This, therefore, is our recommendation submitted to you, that we now proceed to elect a Campaign Committee and a Campaign Manager to conduct a campaign in conjunction with the National Executive Committee, after probably one conference agreeing upon the general lines.

The motion was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we now proceed to the election? Nominations are in order.

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I move that the election of the Campaign Chairman be left in the hands of the National Executive Committee.

DEL. HILLQUIT: The National Executive Committee had the matter under consideration, and prefers that for this important position, this convention make the choice. We might be in a better position to elect the Committee, but we wish the convention as a whole to elect a Campaign Manager, who will have the largest responsibility in this campaign, and whose position will be much more fortified if it comes with the sanction of this large and representative body rather than as the choice of the Executive Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a motion that has been carried, as I understand it, for the nomination and election of a Campaign Committee of five and a Campaign Manager. In what order shall we take them? Campaign Manager first, if there is no objection.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I desire to place in nomination for this position Comrade J. Mahlon Barnes. (Seconded.) In doing so I wish to state to the comrades that I have been on the National Executive Committee a number of years, and I have had opportunity and occasion to observe the work of Comrade Barnes, and while I have no more personal attachment to Barnes or interest in the matter than any other delegate, I wish to say that my colleagues on the National Executive Committee, and on the several committees are unanimous in the opinion that the party has very few men, if any men as efficient, as painstaking, as devoted, and, on the whole, as fit for the position as Comrade Barnes. I wish to state also—speaking now personally for myself, and I am very frank in this matter—I think this convention and this party owes a reparation to Comrade Barnes because of the campaign of slander instituted against him and the hunting up of matters dead and buried years ago and their publication in Socialist papers. I think this was one of the most disgraceful things ever suffered in the Socialist party. (Applause.) I think, as far as I myself am concerned—I do not care whether it is wise, whether it is politic—I think every man among us is entitled to justice, and I speak for Comrade Barnes because I know a great injustice has been done him. (Applause.)

DEL. MERRICK: A point of information. Do I understand this recommendation, that this is the action of the National Executive Committee?

DEL. HILLQUIT: No; it is the nomination of Delegate Hillquit from New York.

DEL. MERRICK: Not the nomination of Barnes; that isn't what I refer to. It is the recommendation of the committee.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Which action?

DEL. MERRICK: The recommendation, not Barnes.

DEL. HILLQUIT: This comes from the Committee on Constitution and also from the National Executive Committee.

DEL. MERRICK: With the endorsement of the National Executive Committee?

DEL. HILLQUIT: A general recommendation, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe Comrade Hillquit was trying to make the point that his nomination was as an individual.

DEL. PREVEY: I am very sorry that in making a nomination, Comrade Hillquit had also to make a speech. Now, I desire to place in nomination for the position of Campaign Manager of the Socialist party for 1912 a man who probably has not been in as close touch with the members of the National Executive Committee as Barnes, but he is a man that has had some experience, not only in campaign managing, but also in executive work in cities and in managing local campaigns, and knows something about arranging meetings. I therefore place in nomination as Campaign Manager for the Socialist party, Carl D. Thompson of Wisconsin. (Applause.) I am sorry that Comrade Hillquit took this occasion to open up the Barnes case. If

Comrade Barnes is again placed in connection with the National office, we are not going ahead as a unified Socialist party in carrying on this campaign. Comrade Hillquit says we owe something to Comrade Barnes. I say we do not owe something to Comrade Barnes. He has been paid for his services. He was compelled to resign under fire, and we do not want to re-open the case.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have had both sides as far as one nomination is concerned. I suggest that in further nominating you cut out all reference to the nominees' private affairs.

DEL. MOTLEY (Ida.): I just want to enter my protest against a delegate on this floor bringing up things that have been dead.

DEL. MORRISON: I want to go on record the same way. The comrade had no right to bring that in.

A delegate placed in nomination Del. Winfield R. Gaylord of Wisconsin.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I nominate a man to take care of the eastern states, Julius Gerber.

DEL. STRICKLAND (Ohio): I would like to put in nomination a comrade whose executive work has not been so great in recent years, but which is just as good as it ever was, a comrade whom we can trust and who will be in very close sympathy with the candidates. I wish to nominate Comrade Seymour Stedman of Illinois. (Applause.)

DEL. GARVER (Mo.): I desire to nominate William M. Brandt of St. Louis.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I nominate Comrade Branstetter of Oklahoma.

DEL. CORY (Wash.): I wish to place in nomination our comrade George H. Goebel.

DEL. GOEBEL: Goebel is for Barnes, and not ashamed of it.

A delegate nominated Oscar Ameringer of Oklahoma.

The nominations were then closed, and the list of nominees was read for acceptance.

DEL. BARNES: I can only say that I don't want a job, I do not need a job, but if I can be of any service to the party in this temporary position I am willing to accept.

DEL. THOMPSON: I decline.

DEL. GAYLORD: I have got both hands full, and if I did not have I would not interfere with Barnes. He needs that job.

The name of Comrade Brandt was called, but there was no response.

THE CHAIRMAN: Unless they are vouched for, they won't stand.

DEL. LARSEN (Ill.): Stedman will be unable to accept. Therefore, I decline for him.

DEL. GARVER: I nominated Comrade Brandt under a misapprehension when you were calling for nominations. I withdraw the name of Brandt.

DEL. BRANSTETTER: Being heartily in accord with the comrade that nominated Barnes, I decline.

DEL. GOEBEL: I echo the sentiments of Branstetter.

DEL. AMERINGER: Being a member of the supreme court that tried Barnes, I decline.

SEC. REILLY: That leaves one nomination, J. Mahlon Barnes of Pennsylvania. On motion of Del. Solomon of New York, Del. Barnes was elected Campaign Manager by acclamation.

Nominations were then called for for members of the Campaign Committee.

NATIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE.

The following nominations were made for the National Campaign Committee:

Dan Hogan, Ark.
Carl D. Thompson, Wis.
James Oneal, Ind.
Margaret Prevey, Ohio.
Tom Lewis, Ore.
Wm. M. Brandt, St. Louis.
James F. Carey, Mass.
Dan White, Mass.
J. W. Slayton, Pa.
W. J. Ghent, Washington, D. C.
Anna A. Maley, Wash.
Fred Kraft, N. J.
Stephen M. Reynolds, Ind.
S. C. Garrison, Ind.
J. Stitt Wilson, Cal.
W. E. Rodriguez, Ill.
A. H. Floaten, Colo.
L. J. Duncan, Mont.
J. E. Snyder, Cal.
O. F. Branstetter, Okla.
A. M. Simons, Kans.
A. Germer, Ill.
Gustav Strebel, N. Y.
Mary O'Reilly, Ill.
Alexander Irvine, Cal.
Clyde J. Wright, Neb.

The following nominees accepted:
Hogan, Lewis, Brandt, White, Slayton, Kraft, Reynolds, Garrison, Wilson, Rodriguez, Duncan, Snyder, Branstetter, Simons, Wright.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I wish to call attention to the fact that the reason for the recommendation for the election of this committee was that the members of the National Executive Committee are scattered all over the United States. If now we are to elect a committee from California and New York, Oregon and New Jersey we are duplicating the same inefficient work.

DEL. WILSON: In view of the statement I decline.

DEL. WHITE: As a delegate from the Atlantic Coast I decline.

DEL. RICHARDSON (Cal.): It is efficient work that we want out of this committee. The committee will have to be in

session for weeks at a time during the campaign. We have got to get men near headquarters, as well as men competent to do the work. I move that no man be elected who lives more than 500 miles from Chicago.

A DELEGATE: I suggest to save time that Comrade Hillquit give us a list of five names for this committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would not entertain that motion.

DEL COLLINS (Colo.): I move that Seidel and Debs be allowed to choose their own campaign committee.

The motion by Delegate Collins was tabled.

DEL SOLOMON (N. Y.): I move that the National Executive Committee together with the nominees for President and Vice-President select the campaign committee.

DEL ZITT (Ohio): I rise to a point of order. We have gone into the nomination of committeemen, and now we are overturning it.

DEL PREVEY (Ohio): I move to amend that the committee be elected from those nominated here.

DEL SOLOMON (N. Y.): It is absurd to waste an hour and a half selecting a committee of five. My motion is that the National Executive Committee in conjunction with the presidential and vice presidential nominees select from the nominees named at this convention five to be the Campaign Committee.

The motion was carried.

DEL ZITT (Ohio): The Ohio delegation wants to be recorded as opposing the introduction of the Barnes matter, not the nomination of Barnes but the speech by Comrade Hillquit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the Comrade represent Ohio?

DEL STRICKLAND (Ohio): As to the introduction of the Barnes matter I regard it as unfortunate and agree with the delegates from Ohio.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Goebel from New Jersey wants to be recorded as saying that when a sneak who is not capable of a fair fight, in an underhanded manner circulates lies against a man, Goebel wishes to go on record as endorsing all that Hillquit said.

DEL MERRICK (Pa.): I wish to be recorded as protesting against the introduction of the Barnes matter while voting for Comrade Barnes as Campaign Manager.

DEL PROSSER (Pa.): I also want to be recorded.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that all of you who wish to be recorded, can come up here and read your names to the Secretary.

EDITING.

On motion a committee of two was appointed to edit the report of the committee, making only such changes as might be necessary for that purpose.

PLATFORM.

The Committee on Platform further recommended that plank 14 of the Political Demand be changed to read: "The enactment of further measures for the conservation of health."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the adoption of this clause?

DEL PATTERSON (Ohio): A point of order. This can not be changed without a vote by a majority of the whole convention.

By consent the section as recommended by the committee was adopted.

DEL STRICKLAND: I want to rise to a question of personal privilege. While I

regretted the introduction of the Barnes matter I want it understood that I agreed with him on the main proposition when it was brought up. I think that the character assassination of which the "Christian Socialist" was guilty was infamous.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is on this fourteenth plank, of the platform.

DEL WHEELER (Cal.): I want to know if that doesn't change the whole subject matter.

DEL DUNCAN (Mont.): It does.

DEL WHEELER: I certainly object to that change. It strikes at the very vitals of the whole thing. We had it debated the other night and it was carried by four to one to put that amendment in there and our delegation are going to see that it stays there if we have any influence.

THE CHAIRMAN: In order to carry this it will require a majority of the whole convention.

On motion the whole matter was laid on the table.

DEL THOMPSON (Wis.): I have a report to present.

IMMIGRATION.

DEL SPARGO (Vt.): We have an order of business adopted here and I move that the reporters on Immigration be now heard and that when they are so heard we close the debate and proceed to a vote.

The motion was duly seconded.

DEL SOLOMON (N. Y.): I move that the Committee on Immigration be continued to present its report at the next convention.

The motion was seconded.

DEL MERRICK (Pa.): I move to amend that we receive the report without debate and vote upon it.

DEL WILSON (Cal.): I desire to speak for the majority report. Comrade Untermyer, who is the chief author of the majority report is absent from the convention and is unable to speak for it. Comrade Hunter of the majority is also absent. Comrade Wanhope and myself, the other two members of the majority had the least to do with drawing this report. I support the amendment of the Comrade from New York that we continue this question in the hands of the committee until the next congress.

DEL MERRICK: I think the comrades came here to vote upon this question. I think we all understand this question, that the reports have been read and that we are intelligent enough to vote upon it without any discussion whatever. But if you vote to re-commit when we go back to our people they will want to know what kind of a convention this is any how when we spend two years preparing reports which you are afraid to vote on. I may be in the minority but I am not afraid to record myself on one side of this question, say where I stand and go back to my constituency and justify my conduct. There is no reason why you can not vote on this question now without any oratory. Let us settle this question now, each of us voting according to his convictions.

DEL SOLOMON (N. Y.): This is not a question of being afraid to vote. The fact is that a great many of us are not in a position to vote intelligently and finally on this question. I think if we pass it over to the next convention by that time we shall be able to pass upon the report that will then be presented. We have nothing to lose and everything to gain by postponing action on this proposition.

know that Spargo has 75 pounds of steam per square inch to unload on this question, but I think we had better postpone action on it.

DEL SPARGO: Just because it is late and we are tired we ought not to make ourselves ridiculous by refusing to act upon the report of the committee that has been working on it for two years. Therefore I am opposed to continuing the committee. In the second place, I am satisfied that the comrades can without any oratory at all, vote on the question, but if you have read these reports I call your attention to this fact, that the majority report makes certain recommendations for exclusion and in the printed report it gives its reasons for so recommending. In the minority report we simply say that we recommend the re-affirmation of the Stuttgart resolution and there is not one word of reason why we make that recommendation. The question is whether you want the majority report with its reasons, Comrade Wanhope was authorized by the majority to present their views and has a right to do it. If you want the majority report you will have to accept the reasons of the majority. They are Untermyer's reasons, they are Wilson's reasons, they are Wanhope's reasons, they are Hunter's reasons, they have all signed it. If you vote for the majority report well and good. All that the minority asks is to place before you the Stuttgart resolution and then to state the reasons why our party should reaffirm that. So far as I am concerned I believe I can state those reasons in ten minutes.

DEL MERRICK: A point of information. Is there not a third report?

DEL SPARGO: That is simply Comrade Laukki's statement. He is with London and myself in our report.

DEL LAUKKI: I stand for the report of the minority. Meyer, London and Spargo state the international position. My statement simply takes into consideration the American conditions at the present time, and I have made some recommendations based on these conditions.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is the substitute by Merrick to receive the reports as printed* and proceed to a vote without debate.

The motion of Comrade Merrick was lost.

The motion of Comrade Solomon that the committee be continued with instructions to further investigate and report at the next convention was carried.

COMMITTEE ON PARTY PRESS.

DEL O'REILLY: In presenting this report I am going to ask that it be referred to the National Executive Committee.

There is no loss in any way by having this report referred to the National Executive Committee. I hope you will do this because during the present campaign it may be found that a party owned printing plant will be entirely practicable and very much needed. In that case leave them in a position to purchase one, and establish one if they wish. That is what the committee asks.

On motion duly seconded it was so ordered.

The report of the committee on Party Press is as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PARTY PRESS.

The rapid growth of the Socialist movement and the increased demand for Socialist literature has created a consider-

able demand for the establishment of a printing plant to be owned and controlled by the Socialist party for printing and publishing Socialist books, pamphlets, leaflets, tracts and other Socialist literature.

The present Socialist news bureau, which can scarcely yet be said to have passed the experimental stage, has already demonstrated its usefulness despite the fact that it has been hampered by lack of funds. Through a proper organization of this bureau and the general co-operation of the Socialist newspapers to be served thereby the Socialist press throughout the country will be greatly strengthened and the movement benefited.

Inasmuch as the sentiment regarding a party-owned newspaper is not crystallized, but considerably divided, we make no recommendation thereon save as hereinafter provided.

We therefore recommend the following:

1. That this convention instruct the National Executive Committee to investigate fully as quickly as possible the feasibility of establishing a party-owned and controlled publishing plant and to purchase and install such plant if upon investigation the same shall be found practicable.

2. That the National Executive Committee call together immediately a conference of all editors and managers of Socialist newspapers for the purpose of enlarging and perfecting the usefulness of the National Socialist News Bureau and of promoting co-operation between the Socialist publications.

3. That a committee of three shall be elected by the National Executive Committee to consist of comrades familiar with Socialist newspaper work and management which shall gather and compile all data obtained from Socialist parties of this and other countries relating to the subject of a party-owned and controlled newspaper. Such committee shall report at the earliest possible moment, and not later than one year to the National Executive Committee and the report of this subcommittee shall be published by the National Office and sent out to the party organizations. All expenses of said committee shall be borne by the National Office.

MARY O'REILLY,
R. A. MAYNARD,
WM. M. WESLEY,
W. A. JACOBS,
J. L. BACHMANN,
MEYER LONDON,
GEO. E. OWEN,
FRED KRAFFT,
S. E. BEARDSLEY,
Committee on Party Press.

DEL S. SADLER (Wash.): I move that all reports of committees not submitted to the convention at its close be referred to the National Executive Committee with power to act.

Delegate Merrick moved to amend that they be referred to the National Committee.

DEL MERRICK: I want to speak on this motion.

DEL SLAYTON: I have been trying to get the eye of the Chairman. Is there only one man in this convention and should he be given the floor all afternoon?

The motion of Delegate Merrick that they be referred to the National Committee was lost.

*Both the majority and minority reports are printed as Appendix J, together with Delegate Laukki's statement.—Editor.

Delegate Sadler's motion to refer it to the National Executive Committee was carried.

DEL. COLLINS: A special matter. I move that we instruct the National Secretary to pay to the ushers, Sergeant-at-arms and clerks not less than \$3 a day for their services during the convention.

The motion was carried.

STATE AND MUNICIPAL PROGRAM.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Thompson will now report for the Committee on State and Municipal Program.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): This report* has been put on your table and if there is no objection I suggest that we can dispose of this in about five minutes in the following manner. In the first place if you have not read the report you can get copies of it and read it. I want to emphasize this point about it, that everything in the report up to the fifth page, and not including the fifth page, is merely suggestive. It is in no sense binding upon any local or State organization but is presented merely as assembling the data from which those who care to may draw such parts as they may find useful in preparing their municipal and State program. Therefore it is unnecessary at this time to read all of it. It is unnecessary to take it under any consideration serially, and I am going to make a motion that that part be adopted as a whole, and afterwards present the recommendation. I move, therefore, Comrade Chairman, that the first part of this report up to and including the first paragraph on page 5 be adopted as a whole.

The motion was carried.

On motion of Comrade Thompson the first clause of the recommendation was adopted.

The recommendation as to the study of unemployment was adopted.

The third recommendation as to the establishment of a legislative bureau on motion of Delegate Solomon was referred to the National Executive Committee.

The section of the report as to resolutions by Comrade Simons was adopted.

Thereupon the report of the committee as a whole was adopted.

REPORT OF THE PUBLICITY COMMITTEE.

The Socialist Convention of 1912 is the first one in the history of the party that has elected a Publicity Committee. Heretofore the Press Committee has considered matters relating to party press and co-operated with the newspaper and general press representatives to the end of securing for the convention and the party as much useful publicity as possible.

It is the latter function that has been assumed by the Publicity Committee of this Convention. We have done all in our power to see that the important actions of the Convention should receive as much and as favorable publicity as possible. In this respect members of the Socialist press have rendered the greatest assistance. We believe that the result has been a considerable improvement in the treatment of our Convention by the general and newspaper press of the United States.

The only recommendation this committee would make is that future conventions should consolidate the Publicity Committee and the Committee on Party Press and that the latter committee should assign three of its members, preferably experienced

newspaper men, to the duty of looking after the welfare of the press representatives at the convention.

FRANK E. WOLFE, Chairman,
EDWARD PERKINS CLARKE,
Secretary,

JOHN HAYDEN,
MAX HAYES,
GUS THEIMER.

DEL. WOLFE (Cal.): Our report is unanimous. I think we have had the most harmonious committee in the convention. Our duties have been to pussyfoot around, and so far as we could look after the comfort of the newspaper men and assist them in every way possible.

We have endeavored to see that the work of the convention should have as wide publicity as possible and the only recommendation that we make is that in the future the Publicity Committee and the Committee on Party Press should be combined and that three members preferably experienced newspaper men should look after the welfare of the press at the convention.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

DEL. SPARGO: We have very few resolutions left. The first one is on nominating women candidates.

"Whereas, an increasing number of women are taking part in industrial activity so that they are today an important factor in economic and social life and are thereby qualifying themselves for participation in political administration;

Therefore, Be it resolved, that the Socialist party deems women equally entitled with men to be nominated for and to be elected to, public office so that they may help to manage our common affairs.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the resolution will be adopted as read.

DEL. SPARGO: The next resolution is on temperance. In substance the resolution is the same as that adopted in 1903, but there are some changes in phrasing with the idea of strengthening and improving it.

TEMPERANCE.

The manufacture and sale for profit of intoxicating and adulterated liquors leads directly to many serious social evils. Intemperance in the use of alcoholic liquors weakens the physical, mental and moral powers.

We hold, therefore, that any excessive indulgence in intoxicating liquors by members of the working class is a serious obstacle to the triumph of our class since it impairs the vigor of the fighters in the political and economic struggle, and we urge the members of the working class to avoid any indulgence which might impair their ability to wage a successful political and economic struggle, and so hinder the progress of the movement for their emancipation.

We do not believe that the evils of alcoholism can be eradicated by repressive measures or any extension of the police powers of the capitalist state—alcoholism is a disease of which capitalism is the chief cause. Poverty, overwork and overworry necessarily result in intemperance on the part of the victims. To abolish the wage system with all its evils is the surest way to eliminate the evils of alcoholism and the traffic in intoxicating liquor.

The resolution was adopted as read.

The next resolution on the subject of military education of children was read as follows:

MILITARY EDUCATION OF CHILDREN.

Whereas, The capitalist class is making determined and persistent efforts to use the public schools for the military training of children and for the inculcation of the military spirit; therefore be it

Resolved, That we are opposed to all efforts to introduce military training into the public schools, and that we recommend the introduction into our public school system of a thorough and progressive course in physical culture, and

Resolved, That we request the National Executive Committee to suggest plans and programs along this line and furnish these to the party membership, together with such advice in the matter as may be helpful to the party membership in introducing such a system into our public schools.

On motion the resolution was adopted as read.

The next resolution, protesting against the Dillingham Bill, was then read as follows:

THE DILLINGHAM BILL.

Whereas, the Dillingham bill passed by the United States Senate would bar from this country many political refugees under a hollow distinction that some political crimes involve "moral turpitude"; and

Whereas, such distinctions would destroy the political asylum, heretofore maintained in this country, for revolutionists of all lands, as the officials of one country cannot sit in judgment over the methods of political strife and civil war in another country; and

Whereas, Senator Root's amendment providing for deportation without trial of 'any alien who shall take advantage of his residence in the United States to conspire with others for the violent overthrow of a foreign government, recognized by the United States,' passed by the United States Senate, without a dissenting vote, seeks to establish in this country a passport system for aliens, thus destroying at once the principle that it is the right of every people to overthrow by force, if necessary, a despotic government, declared in the Declaration of Independence, and the principle of individual freedom from police supervision, heretofore held sacred in this country; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Socialist party at Indianapolis, Ind., on the 16th day of May, 1912, in National Convention assembled, that we protest against this attempt of the United States Senate to turn the government of this country into a detective agency for foreign governments in their persecution of men and women fighting for the freedom of their native lands; be it further

Resolved, That we demand that the United States shall remain, as heretofore, an asylum for political refugees from all countries, without any distinction as to political crimes or supervision of political refugees; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives and to every member of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

On motion the resolution was carried.

The next resolution, in reference to Young People's Socialist organizations was then read as follows:

YOUNG PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST ORGANIZATIONS.

Whereas, a fertile and promising field for Socialist education is found among the young people, both because it reaches persons with unprejudiced and unbiased minds, and because it yields the most valuable recruits for the Socialist movement; and

Whereas, if we can gain the ear of a majority of the youth of our country, the future will be ours, with the passing of the present generation. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we recommend and urge our Locals to form, encourage and assist Young Socialist Leagues and Young People's Clubs for the purpose of educating our youth in the principles of Socialism, and that this education be combined with social pleasures and athletic exercises; and further

Resolved, That we recommend to the National Executive Committee to give such aid and encouragement to this work as may seem to it best calculated to further the spread of Socialism among the youth of the United States.

The resolution was adopted as read.

DEL. SPARGO: The following resolution on the restriction of citizenship submitted by the State Delegation of Washington is favorably reported by your committee. I move its adoption:

RESTRICTIONS ON CITIZENSHIP.

Whereas, The courts in charge of naturalization have shown a disposition to enlarge the interpretation of the rule which prohibits the naturalization of avowed anarchists, so that anyone who disbelieves in the present system of society has been held to be ineligible to become an American citizen;

And, whereas this tendency found a most aggravated expression in the revocation of the citizenship of Leonard Olson, a Socialist, at Tacoma, Washington, by Judge Cornelius Hanford;

Therefore be it Resolved, that the Socialist party in convention assembled enters its most emphatic protest against such procedure and points out that the denial of the right of citizenship to foreign born applicants not anarchists because they hold progressive ideas inevitably forces those now voters into the ranks of those who believe in force and violence;

And be it further resolved that a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and that we demand of him that an order be issued to the effect that this rule in naturalization cases shall be strictly interpreted and not enlarged to include persons who simply hold Socialistic or progressive social ideas.

The motion was carried as read.

DEL. SPARGO: This is the last resolution:

"The convention hereby expresses its thanks to the officers of the convention for their services and to the Comrades of Local Marion County for their hospitality and friendly assistance."

The resolution was carried by a unanimous vote.

DEL. SPARGO: That concludes our report and we ask our discharge. Perhaps I ought to say here that many resolutions which referred to us when first read here were by us, after consideration, referred to other committees, such as the committees on Platform and Constitution, and the National Executive Committee, because they seemed to us to properly belong to such other committees. That

*The report is printed in full, as appended K. Editor.

explains why some important resolutions have not been reported by us. I thank you.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

DEL. LE SEUER (N. D.): We have here what I believe a good report. It is so unimportant however, that I am not going to take time to read it. It relates to nothing but the ways and means in which we can raise funds to elect our candidates. Of course that doesn't matter so I am going to ask you to refer it to the National Committee with authority to act.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

To the 1912 National Socialist Convention: Comrades—The problem of financing a proletarian movement presents one of the most serious questions with which the movement has to deal, but it is hoped that the following recommendation will be of assistance in solving that question for the coming campaign:

First—We recommend that an assessment of \$1.00 be made against each member of the Party, except, that in no case shall the assessment be more than \$1.00 for husband and wife jointly.

Second—We recommend that a 1912 "Booster's Campaign Badge" be furnished by the National Executive Committee to the secretaries of the several States in an amount equal at least to the number of the dues-paying members in each State, to be sold at \$1.00 per badge, and furnished free to all those paying their \$1.00 assessment.

Third—That a call be issued by the National Secretary for special collections at local meetings and propaganda meetings for the Campaign Fund.

Fourth—That an appeal be made through the Party Press and through all Party communications calculated to fall naturally into the hands of labor, that labor make common cause with the Socialist Party by contributing to its Campaign Fund, and by voting at the polls labor's ticket—the ticket of the Socialist Party.

Fifth—We believe that a suggestion through the National Bulletin to the Locals that the women comrades put on special programs, making a full charge for admission, is a plan that would result in splendid propaganda as well as some revenue.

Sixth—In reference to the resolution of W. Lanfersiek asking assistance for several Southern States, we believe the following to be the proper disposal of the same. Much evidence was submitted before this committee, showing the needs for assistance of the Southern States mentioned. We recommend that the National Executive Committee pass upon the needs of each State when presented through the regular official channels and give all possible assistance to all States so applying, and recommend to said States that the applications for assistance by the said States, specify their particular needs, as for instance, that when speakers are routed through the Southern State organizations, owing to the fact that no Northern organizers can secure as good results as men familiar with local conditions. We, therefore, recommend that this resolution be referred to the National Executive Committee.

Seventh—In reporting upon the moving picture resolution, this committee realizes that moving pictures and charts are of high value in presenting the philosophy of Socialism to the uninitiated and believe that a moving picture bureau might succeed at this time, and we recommend that the National Executive Committee take such steps as are necessary to determine whether the same is feasible or not.

We recommend that this resolution also be referred to the National Executive Committee, and if sufficient money to provide good sets of slides and films for portable moving picture machines and moving picture shows can be spared from the party funds, the money would be well spent. The slides to be furnished to organizers, lecturers and moving picture houses at cost, and sets to be exchanged at will by purchasers when kept in good condition. We believe this plan would result eventually in one of the best means of propaganda.

Fraternally submitted,
ARTHUR LE SEUER,
MILO C. JONES,
MARGARET D. BROWN,
GEORGE W. BACON,
L. B. IRWIN,
E. L. REGUIN,
L. F. STEWART,
MAX BOEHM,
O. S. WATKINS.

It was moved and seconded that the report be referred to the Campaign Committee, which motion was carried.

TELEGRAM TO COMRADE TOM MANN.
DEL. SEIDEL (Wis.): I should like to present a message and ask this convention to send it to Tom Mann of England who has been jailed for advising the soldiers not to fire upon their working brothers. I have adopted similar methods in the city of Milwaukee, directing the Chief of Police not to permit the use of the police department to use the powers of the police against the strikers. I do not believe that it is right that we should pay taxes—and no matter what you say we have to pay taxes; you can't maintain government five minutes without taxation—I don't believe it is right that the taxes we pay should go towards maintaining a police department or any kind of military force that when I go out to improve my living condition that mailed fist of police or military should be used against me, to keep me down. I don't think there is any class in this country or any other country that have the right to expect that from its soldiers, its police department or its state constabulary.

I therefore ask that this message be sent in the name of the Socialist Party of America to Tom Mann, Manchester Jail, England:

"GREETINGS: We cheer your stand against fratricide."

That is all I ask to be said. I think it is plain and simply says that we must not murder our brothers.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

NAT. SEC. WORK: Reports have been made by the seven foreign-speaking organizations affiliated with the National office. I move that they be received without reading and made a part of the proceedings. Seconded and carried.

COMMITTEE ON CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): A committee on investigation of the Co-operative Movement was provided for and would

come up under unfinished business at this time. The committee have talked the matter over and unanimously recommend that these names be placed upon that committee subject to the approval of the National Executive Committee, and with power to fill vacancies. Comrades Vlag, New York, Edwards, Texas, Hayes of Illinois, Gaylord, Wisconsin, Corey, Washington.

There is a special reason for putting Comrade Hayes on this committee. He is connected with the mine workers where there is a movement of this kind under way. For myself I will promise the co-operation of one great University and I am positive that I can secure the co-operation of another for such impartial investigation of this subject as we have never had in this country.

The motion of Delegate Gaylord was carried.

COMMITTEE ON STATE AND MUNICIPAL PROGRAM.

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): In connection with the recommendation by Comrade Thompson that a committee of seven members be elected for State and Municipal Program, I move that the existing committee be continued as that committee.

The motion was seconded and carried.

REPORT OF CONGRESSMAN BERGER.
DEL. JACOBS (Wis.): Comrade Berger's report is here in print. I move that it be received and made a part of the proceedings of this convention.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have something that may require action by the convention.

"Indianapolis, Ind., May 18, 1912.

"To the Delegates of the National Convention:

"I hereby tender my resignation from your Committee on Immigration.

"JOSHUA WANHOPE."

A DELEGATE: I don't blame him either.

THE CHAIRMAN: This Committee on Immigration was continued. Shall we fill the vacancy now?

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I move that the Committee be given power to fill the vacancy.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

DEL. KATE SADLER: I just want to have the last word from Washington to let the convention know that Washington is still ahead of the procession. In the first resolution today we recommended the nomination of woman candidates. We expect our leader and standard bearer in the next campaign to be a woman, Comrade Anna Maley of Washington.

(Loud cheers.)

DEL. WHEELER (Cal.): I move that this convention extend to the Press of Indianapolis a vote of thanks for the courteous treatment that has been accorded to this convention.

The motion was carried unanimously.

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): I move that for the next National Convention the National Executive Committee be instructed to co-operate with the local comrades in order to conduct during the convention or at its close, a significant public meeting or pub-

lic meetings, instead of having things conducted as they were this time.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I move to lay the motion on the table.

DEL. SPARGO (Vt.): I protest against the adoption of the resolution because of the intimation contained in it that the National Executive Committee at this convention would not co-operate with the local comrades. I remind you further that there are certain well established usages about the reception of conventions. When we go to a town or city to hold our convention the comrades in that city become our hosts. It is their practice to arrange meetings and we co-operate with them. In this instance the local comrades arranged an impossible schedule, and then the National Executive Committee, in the interests of the convention had to consult with those comrades and try to get things arranged on a satisfactory basis.

I object to this eleventh hour slap in the face given to the National Executive Committee, and we might be better employed singing the Marseillaise before we go home.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think that Comrade Wilson intended any slur on the National Executive Committee.

DEL. WILSON: I had no such thing in my mind. My hope was that at the next National Convention we should have meetings, and have them of such a character and such significance as would stamp our influence upon that community as we had the opportunity to do last night.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of this motion will say aye.

The motion was carried.

DEL. DUNCAN (Mont.): I think there is some misapprehension here as to a petition that has been circulated here this convention. It has been stated here this afternoon that there is no disposition on the part of us who are signing this petition to re-open a matter which was decided in this convention. This petition is in accordance with the new constitution which allows a certain number of delegates to send for submission to the party referendum an alternative section or paragraph or article when the matter goes out to the party. This petition is simply to bring up an alternative paragraph to be submitted to the full referendum of the party, so that the whole party may have a chance to choose between the statement adopted here yesterday regarding our attitude toward labor organizations, or the one that some of the rest of us wanted to have adopted. We do not wish you to go away with the idea that we have misled you into thinking that the matter is not to be opened elsewhere. It is not to be opened on the floor of this convention, and we simply want the party to express its opinion on this subject.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): They will.

A telegram was read from the secretary of the Socialist Party in San Diego: "Attorney Fred Moore and stenographer arrested this morning. Charges not known. Writ of habeas corpus in preparation. Vigilantes active."

DEL. SPARGO: Mr. Chairman, I now move you that we adjourn sine die. Seconded.

The motion was carried.

The convention then adjourned sine die.

APPENDIX A

Rules of the Socialist Party, National Convention, 1912.

1. A chairman and vice-chairman shall be elected at the beginning of each day's session.
2. A permanent secretary and two assistants, who may be chosen from outside the body of delegates, shall be elected for the entire Convention.
3. A reading clerk shall be appointed by the secretary, and he may appoint one or more assistants.
4. A permanent sergeant-at-arms and assistants, who may be chosen from outside the body of delegates, shall be appointed by the chairman.
5. The sergeant-at-arms shall appoint 24 messengers to assist him, who shall serve in relays of 8.
6. Four permanent tellers and 2 permanent judges to count all ballots shall be elected, and in addition there shall be appointed by the chair, for the purpose of tabulating the vote on the various Convention Committees, 20 special tellers.
7. The 6 committees named in the National Constitution, viz.:
 - A Committee on Platform of 9 members.
 - A Committee on Constitution of 9 members.
 - A Committee on Resolutions of 9 members.
 - A Committee on Ways and Means of 9 members.
 - A Committee on Reports of National Officers of 7 members.
 - A Committee on International Relations of 5 members.
- and the following additional committees shall be elected, each committee to be composed of the number of delegate stated and of not more than one delegate from the same state:
 - A Publicity Committee of 5 members.
 - An Auditing Committee of 5 members.
 - A Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations of 9 members.
 - A Committee on Labor Organizations and Their Relation to the Socialist Party of 9 members.
 - A Committee on Co-Operatives of 7 members.
 - A Committee on State and Municipal Program of 9 members.
8. Discussion shall be limited to 5 minutes for each speaker. Chairmen of committees shall have 20 minutes to report. No delegate shall speak a second time, until all desiring to use their time shall have had an opportunity to speak.
9. The sessions of the Convention shall be from 10:00 a. m. to 1:00 p. m. and from 2:30 to 5:30 p. m. Night sessions as ordered.
10. Robert's Rules of Order shall be used, with the exceptions that when the previous question has been called, one

delegate on each side may speak for 5 minutes; also, that the previous question may be called for by a majority vote.

11. During the sessions, no smoking or chewing of tobacco shall be allowed.

12. Each delegation shall select one of its members to announce its vote. The vote of no state shall be cast as a unit where the delegates of such state are not in agreement on the matter up for vote; provided, that where an instruction has been given by referendum on a particular question the instruction on that particular question shall be obeyed.

13. Each delegation shall designate in the absence of any delegate, the alternate who shall fill such vacancy.

14. Such members of the National Executive Committee who are not delegates, and the National Secretary shall have a voice and no vote in the Convention. This provision also applies to members of the Women's National Committee.

15. Neither contesting or contested delegates shall vote upon any question in relation to their rights to be seated.

16. The nomination for candidates for President and Vice-President shall be by at least a majority of all the votes cast.

17. A roll call shall be had when demanded by at least 50 delegates.

18. On Friday, May 17th, at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon, all business of the Convention shall be suspended, and the Convention shall proceed to the nomination of President and Vice-President of the United States.

19. The Convention shall adjourn not later than Saturday, May 18th, at midnight.

20. All speeches of welcome shall be made after the Convention is permanently organized, and shall be limited to 5 minutes each.

21. All resolutions offered from the floor of the Convention shall be referred by the Chairman to the proper Committee without discussion.

22. At 5:00 o'clock on each day, the Chairman shall suspend the business then pending before the Convention and accept and dispose of Resolutions offered by delegates.

23. The discussion on any report, resolution or other subject before the Convention shall not exceed four hours. The time for such discussion shall be divided equally, as nearly as possible, between the delegates representing the various views on the subjects.

24. Acceptances and declinations shall be called for after the nominations for all Committees shall have been completed, and no delegate shall accept the nomination for more than one Committee.

25. The rules may be suspended at any time by a two-thirds majority of the delegates voting.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The Order of Business for each day of the Convention shall be as follows:

1. The Convention shall be called to order by the Chairman of the preceding day, or in his absence by the Vice-Chairman, or the National Secretary, and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall be elected for the day, as otherwise directed.
2. Roll call of delegates, unless dispensed with upon motion.

3. Reading of Minutes of preceding day, unless dispensed with on motion.
4. Communications.
5. Reports on Credentials.
6. Unfinished business of the previous day.
7. Reports of Committees in the order above enumerated, except that the report of the Representative in Congress shall follow the report of the Committee on International Relations.
8. New business.
9. Adjournment.

APPENDIX B

Report of Committee on Education.

1. IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION OF INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

The industrial revolution has made the development of individual skill essential to the maintenance of the various productive processes. Although the specialization of processes has made it possible to employ profitably larger and larger numbers of unskilled workers, economically and commercially efficient production really calls for a larger proportion of skilled workers than were employed even when production was largely carried on by means of hand labor. The reason for this may be seen in the fact that on the one hand the proportion of agricultural laborers has steadily decreased, while the proportion of those engaged in manufacture and transportation has increased; and on the other hand, the increased use of machinery in agriculture and transportation, together with the specialization in agricultural methods, create the need for skilled workers even in these branches of production.

The intense competition between the capitalists of different countries has led to the organization and administration of industries upon the principle of quick returns. As a result, low-grade labor applied to specialized processes has been exploited to the utmost. In consequence of this practice, the cultivation of agencies to supply skilled labor has been neglected. On the other hand, boys and girls sent to the factories early in life and attached to the specialized machines, have been given no opportunity to acquire trade knowledge and trade skill commensurate with a high earning power.

Cheap child labor was able for years to yield satisfactory returns to the capitalists. It is not, however, capable either of sustaining industries in competition with skilled workers, or of developing a population having high standards of living. In other words, the retention of large portions of the population at low levels of industrial skill is not only extremely wasteful economically, however profitable it may have been to certain classes of capitalists in the past, but it is positively disastrous socially. A mass of unskilled workers, being poorly paid, necessarily maintain a low standard of living; but what is still worse, such a body is a fertile breeding spot for all social vices and a source of crime and misery that make the task of the social worker and educator almost hopeless. Unskilled and untrained workers are condemned not to frugal lives, but to miserable lives. The misery of the poverty resulting from such conditions lies in the moral debasement which it involves. Or, we may say that a population of skillful workers is more productive and more prosperous even under modern capitalistic conditions. Giv-

en the machinery and the technology today available, a highly skilled body of workers has the possibilities of high-grade living; with the same machinery and technology an unskilled population is condemned to inhuman conditions of living.

Hand in hand with the development of our industry there has been a decay of the ancient methods for developing skill in workers. On the one hand, industries have been driven from the home, where formerly the children became acquainted with many processes and principles which the children of today for the most part do not learn. On the other hand, the industries have become specialized so that the young boy or girl going into the mills or shops has no opportunity to acquire a trade. It has been more profitable for the employers to keep the children at the special machines than to teach them the trades; it has also been more remunerative to the children, for the time being, to stay at a single machine than to learn the trade. The demand for quick profits on the one hand, and the necessity for maximum family earnings on the other, have between them done much to destroy the apprenticeship possibilities of modern industry.

Even when large manufacturers realize the importance of training up skilled workers, they are frequently deterred by the consideration that after a workman is trained there is no assurance that his superior services will be available to the employer that went to the trouble and expense of training him. For well-known reasons, the working population is unstable. Changes of industrial methods, fluctuations in market conditions, the state of "finances," political expediency or pressure, industrial disputes and other social forces constantly drive the workers hither and thither. On the other hand, the sons and daughters of the workers could not for the most part afford to apprentice themselves to a trade because for a few years a young person can make more money at odd jobs and at specialized factory work than at an apprenticeship; and the few dollars additional is an important consideration to the parents. The result has been that more than half of the young people who leave the schools at about the age of fourteen drift into occupations which have absolutely no future for them except to continue to work as men and women at wages that can be earned by boys and girls.

The fact that the industries have been driven from the home and apprenticeship from the shops necessitates a new instrument for developing the potential skill and industrial efficiency of the boys and girls who are to be the workers of the rising generation. The gradual extension of the

functions of the schools is in part due to the growing complexity of closely integrated societies; but it is also in large part due to the growing need for a means to develop industrial skill, etc. It is for this reason that attention is directed to the schools in connection with problems of industrial efficiency, commercial supremacy, agricultural adequacy, etc.

2. WHY THE SCHOOLS ARE INADEQUATE.

The schools on their side have never been organized to adjust themselves automatically to the changing needs of society or of the various communities. The work of the schools not only deals with traditions, the accumulated wisdom and experience of the race; its very process is traditional in manner. The organization of our schools follows an ancient model, whereby what is established and accepted is readily imparted to the youth; but whereby whatever is new or different is sharply scrutinized and frequently discredited. Now the traditional in education is of a nature that is admirably adapted to the needs of those classes that in former times alone had access to "education"—namely, the professional and the leisure classes, but those materials, while they are desirable still, in large measure, for the professional workers, and even for the leisure of industrial and other workers, are of no direct value in developing the kinds of knowledge and skill that most men and women need. In former times the mass of people obtained their training in civilization or "culture" through imitation of the customs and manners of their elders, and their education in efficiency in the homes and fields and shops. The admission of the masses to the schools has coincided with the elimination of the various complex productive processes from the homes and from the daily experience of the children. The social life, too, has changed, so that the boys and girls cannot "pick up" their civilization any more than they can pick up their trades. And so again we see the need for having the school undertake an education that is quite different from that formerly offered, and one intimately related to the conditions and manners of modern life.

3. ATTITUDE OF DIFFERENT CLASSES TOWARD THE NEW EDUCATION.

Leaders of trade and labor organizations have for many years realized the necessity for supplementing the work of the schools and the opportunities of the shops with additional training specifically related to the new processes and the new instruments of industry. Leading educators and far-sighted publicists have also worked toward a closer correlation between schools and life and industry. Many special institutions have been founded for the purpose of giving young men and women direct preparation for the technical work of modern industry. But most institutions had before them chiefly the problems of those who were to become superintendents and managers of works rather than those who were to become the rank and file of the workers. And most of those who donated to establishment of such schools had in mind chiefly the provision of opportunities for the exceptionally able and ambitious, rather than education for the mass of workers.

More recently there has been a growing realization for the necessity of introducing industrial education systematically to the end that every prospective worker shall

have an opportunity to acquire a reasonable degree of skill and knowledge before entering upon the working years. That this feeling was first organized and exploited by employers is due, to the fact that citizens of this class were in a position both to feel the effects of lack of skill on the part of the workers, and to command the intelligence to organize a remedy. Where the members of the labor unions felt the need for industrial training they either established their own schools or modestly asked for the introduction of manual training into the public schools; they never organized an extensive agitation on the subject. But because the manufacturers did organize such an agitation, and because they used rather crude arguments in the course of this agitation, many members of the labor organizations at once became suspicious of the motives and purposes of the manufacturers.

The baldest argument for industrial education is that skilled workers earn more wages than unskilled, and that a population made up of skilled workers is therefore more prosperous, and the state or community that educates its children to industrial efficiency is better off than one that neglects such education. The crude reply of the suspicious working population is that an industrially educated worker can produce more profits to the employer, and that where "general education" is replaced by industrial education the working population is deprived of access to avenues of personal culture and satisfaction of which no one today should be deprived. These two views are both true enough, but they are not necessarily in conflict. Whatever the employer may think of the desirability of liberalizing education for all the people, he knows that the raw material supplied him by the schools cannot yield as high a rate of profit as a body of well trained workmen. And whatever the worker may think of our prevailing economic system, he must recognize that higher skill commands higher wages.

The educators and teachers have taken up a thorough and systematic consideration of the problem only within a very few years. Representing the impersonal "public" and trying to view the situation without bias, they have eventually reconciled the various conflicting interests and established the needed education upon a firmer foundation than that demanded by the workers in the trades or by the employers of labor. This point of view lays emphasis upon the fact that society, as represented by its governmental and administrative agencies, is interested primarily in men and women and not in profits and wages. Our common schools fail to adjust the children to the kinds of lives that the vast majority of them must come to lead—that is, the lives of working men and women. Without prejudice to the education of those who are to become professional or agricultural or commercial workers, the schools should fit those whose occupations will be found in the industries. Without loss of those elements in our culture that is the right heritage of every boy and girl, each child should have the same opportunity to become an efficient worker as is now given to the four per cent who become professional workers.

Another point that must be emphasized by the educator as representing the interests of society as a whole is the importance of training for citizenship. The elementary instruction in reading, writing

and arithmetic, which so many of the older people consider an adequate return from the school is certainly not sufficient to assure that the potential savage in every child will be displaced by the potential citizen. The educator demands, then, that training for efficiency shall be admitted into the schools; but he stipulates that this shall not be allowed to encroach upon the demands of individual development and the claims of good citizenship. The attitude of the Socialist party as representing the interests of a society made up of workers must coincide with that of the far-sighted educators, who represent the interests of the common humanity in society as a whole.

4. THE KINDS OF SCHOOLS NECESSARY.

Experiments in vocational training are by no means new. Indeed, the traditional education of the schools and colleges is but a relic of what was at one time vocational education for the "clerical" or ministers. Private schools for training in special branches of mechanical trades or of commerce, as well as public schools for various professions, are old and well established. The United States Military and Naval Academies are examples of specialized vocational schools maintained by the national government. Many of the states support schools for training in agriculture, law, medicine, dentistry, engineering and other professional vocations. The equipment necessary for adequate training in medicine and certain other branches is so expensive that no school for training physicians could be operated for profit and at the same time give education satisfying modern standards. Training for other vocations, however, is not so expensive, and is carried on largely in private schools conducted for profit. There are a number of such schools that devote themselves to the training of men and women for the various trades.

A third type of vocational school is that established by endowment from philanthropic motives. Many of these have done excellent work, although most of them have concerned themselves chiefly with training foremen and superintendents. A fourth type of school is the corporation school, established in connection with some industry for the purpose of training workers for that industry. A number of railroad companies, several large manufacturing companies and some commercial corporations have established such schools. These schools attempt to organize a system of apprenticeship under conditions of modern industry.

Private schools for teaching trades have frequently had the defect that they were more concerned with getting the student's fee than they were with turning out capable workers. The philanthropic or endowed schools are as a rule efficient as far as they go; but the form of management makes them very pliant to meet the needs of employers in case of industrial disputes. This is inevitable, since they depend altogether upon the support and good will of men belonging to the employing class. The corporation or apprenticeship schools have, on the whole, produced the most effective types of instruction with relation to industrial efficiency. If our sole concern were in producing highly skilled mechanics, the shop schools of the large corporations should be taken as models for industrial education.

But while the production of highly skilled mechanics is essential to the prosper-

ity of any industrial nation, that is not the sole consideration. The nation needs not only skilled workers, but men and women of independent spirit, men and women with an appreciation of the meaning of civilization, men and women who can insist upon having more out of life than mere opportunity to earn a living. Now we cannot depend upon schools conducted for profit to give us such men and women; we cannot depend upon schools endowed by philanthropists to give us such men and women; we cannot depend upon schools operated by corporations to give us the desired type of education. If the public cares for education that aims at such results, the public must itself establish and control the schools. It therefore devolves upon the public school to modify and to extend its program to include training for vocational efficiency. It is only the public school that can protect the interests of the children of the public as well as advance those interests.

In this connection attention should be called to a system of part-time schools which is being tried experimentally at many points. Under this plan there is an arrangement between employers and school officials by which the younger workers are allowed to spend a part of the time in school and a part in the shop. The division of time is various—as alternate weeks, or half-day in school and half in the shop, etc. In this way the boys have an opportunity to learn the trade under shop conditions, while the school work is closely correlated with the shop work. These experiments should be watched with interest as they must be very instructive as to methods of conducting industrial education; but they are not likely to be entirely satisfactory since under some of the arrangements the employer determines what boys are or are not to have an opportunity to learn the trade, while under all the plans the employer is in a position to direct the work of the school too much. The employers must not be allowed to control the schools for their advantage any more than a trade union may be allowed to restrict opportunities of workers to its advantage.

The public schools that have introduced industrial courses with a view to giving industrial education independent of commercial shops are likely to be handicapped at first, and for some time to come, by the lack of suitable equipment and by the impossibility of obtaining suitable teachers in sufficient numbers. But eventually this type of school will probably be the most satisfactory. A temporary device that will have to serve for many years is the continuation school, whether day or evening. These schools, conducted by the public school officials, furnish education supplementary to the various occupations for boys and girls who have to go to work before receiving complete preparation. These schools are specialized to meet the needs of different groups of workers. Evening schools should be avoided for young people, as far as possible. The amount of work required of them in shops and factories should be restricted by law, that they may have the opportunity to attend school without detriment to their health and physical development.

According to the prevailing methods of school administration a pupil generally remains in school as long as his parents can afford to keep him, without regard to whether he is getting any good out of it or not; or a pupil leaves school when his family can no longer afford to keep him

there, whether he is benefiting from the education or not. In either case both the amount and the kind of schooling are made to depend too frequently upon the financial condition of the family instead of upon the capacity and the interests of the pupil.

In recognition of the unhappy results of the haphazard selection of occupations and of schooling, there has grown the movement for vocational guidance. Vocational guidance is a logical consequence of present-day conditions, and especially of the establishment of industrial education. The principles developed by the students of vocational guidance, although the study is still in its beginning, can be applied to the problem of how pupils are to be distributed with respect to the different vocational courses. This is especially important for avoiding the diversion of boys and girls into "blind-alley" occupations.

If, however, it is acknowledged that pupils should be prepared for the vocations to which they are best fitted by native capacities and interests, insofar as the needs of the various callings will permit, there are at once raised two other problems that are fundamental. The first is, how can we assure the pupil that he will not be obliged to quit school and go to work before his training is completed? And the second is, how can we assure the pupil that there will be an opportunity for him to serve in the chosen calling after his schooling is completed?

In regard to the first of these problems, we have to go beyond the usual compulsory-education laws. As at present administered these laws simply keep an unwilling boy or girl in school, or deprive the family of the earnings of the child. Of course, the child should have all the schooling that he can possibly turn to good use; however, when the compulsion is resented by both pupil and parent, nothing but bitterness results. In some states the plan of subsidizing older pupils as long as they remain in school has resulted in an increased attendance. The proposal to pay pupils for attending school will have to be seriously considered, for it is more important to society that each individual be adequately trained than that the child should earn the few paltry dollars. Not only is it true that in general the days of youth are for learning, not earning; but we must recognize that beyond a certain point the cost of the child's education should fall properly upon society as a whole rather than upon the parent; and where the cost becomes a hardship, in the sense that the parents cannot support the child at school, the burden must be borne by society.

In regard to the second question, that of assuring employment to those who have been educated for special kinds of work, the immediate outlook is not very clear. Public schooling cannot long be continued on the theory that it is to prepare individual pupils for a keener competition with one another. Public schooling can be supported only on the theory that it contributes to some common or social advantage. Now the common interests require that every employable adult be given an opportunity to work, and that the worker and work be as comfortably and as efficiently adjusted to each other as possible. It is possible, by means of suitable statistical studies, to approximate with a fair degree of accuracy the proportions of an existing body of children that could be profitably prepared for given vocations

to be entered upon by them say ten years hence. But if all our children are thus directed into the various trades and professions, there is no assurance that all of them will find remunerative employment when they are prepared for it. As long as the private ownership and control of the large instruments of production and distribution keeps a certain proportion of the population always unemployed, it is impossible to foretell what proportions will be employed when all are employable. The ultimate solution of this problem lies, of course, in society's ownership of its industries as well as of its educational machinery.

Other problems suggested, such as the disposition of the product of the school shops, the training of teachers, etc., do not affect the general principles discussed.

SUMMARY.

1. IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION.

High skill among workers necessary to maintain industrial advance.

High skill necessary to give workers a decent basis for living.

Industrial training no longer possible in the home.

Industrial training no longer sufficiently available in the industries themselves.

Lack of training drives the majority of children into "blind-alley" occupations that lead to nothing.

Extension of the functions of the school suggested as a means for furnishing industrial training.

2. WHY THE SCHOOLS ARE INADEQUATE (AS NOW CONDUCTED).

The schools have to do with matters that are important to those who enter the professions.

Most of the school work is of no significance to those who are to do other kinds of work.

We must still depend upon the school to preserve and to transmit accumulated race experience, "culture" and the basis of civilization.

3. ATTITUDE OF DIFFERENT CLASSES TOWARDS INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

Need for industrial education appreciated by the workers.

Systematic agitation for it started by employers.

Employers look to getting better workers and hence larger profits.

Workers look to getting higher wages.

Educators and publicists are concerned primarily with producing better men and women, and with making better citizens.

Industrial training must be introduced, but it must not interfere with training for citizenship and for culture.

4. THE KINDS OF SCHOOLS FOR INDUSTRIAL TRAINING.

Private schools; conducted for profit. These are more concerned with fees than with efficiency of work.

Endowed or philanthropic schools; these frequently do good work on the technical side, contribute little or nothing to citizenship or culture, and are under the domination, as a rule, of the employers.

Corporation or apprenticeship schools; these do very effective work, so far as they go; they are completely dominated by the interests of the employers, and ignore, as a rule, all that has to do with civilized living and with citizenship.

Public schools; these being under the control of the public, cannot be so readily diverted to the service of a portion of the

public; they carry the traditions of education for citizenship and culture.
Part-time schools; advantage of co-operation between shop and school; danger of class domination and restriction.

5. FURTHER IMPLICATION.

Control must be truly representative of the public.
Public education should not be uniform education.

Differentiated courses should be administered with reference to the needs and capacities of pupils, not with reference to the economic status of the parents.

There should be systematic study of vocational guidance.

There is implied a school-attendance subsidy.

And the ultimate control of industry by the public.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

1. Approval of national, state and local action leading to the establishment of vocational instruction in the elementary schools. (Vocational includes agricultural, commercial, domestic and professional as well as industrial. Much of the school work is already vocational for those entering the professions—about four per cent of the pupils; no changes are needed in this direction.)

2. Approval of the establishment of vocational guidance work in cities and towns.

3. Approval of extension of census work, or the establishment of permanent

census work in the direction of yielding information as to the industrial changes and as to the character of the population.

4. Approval of extension of age of compulsory education, with provisions for monetary compensation wherever necessary.

5. Support of legislation that will prohibit all work for children which does not lead to increasing economic and social worth.

6. Opposition to arrangements between school (public) officials and shop owners that leave the control of the education in the hands of the employers.

7. Insistence upon the control of industrial education being in the hands of truly representative bodies.

8. Insistence upon the subordination, in public schools, of skill and speed to understanding and appreciation.

9. Insistence upon emphasis being laid upon citizenship and manhood and womanhood.

10. Insistence upon administration that will permit of flexible readjustment of pupils to their own developing powers on the one hand, and to changing economic conditions on the other.

Fraternally submitted,

BENJAMIN GRUENBERG,

G. A. STREBEL,

BERTHA H. MAILLY, Committee.

[Note: This report was not adopted by the convention, but referred to a new standing committee on the subject.—Editor.]

APPENDIX C

Report of Committee on Commission Form of Government.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY FOR THE STUDY OF THE COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR CITIES.

THE COMMITTEE.

J. J. Jacobsen (Iowa), Chairman.
Carl D. Thompson (Wis.), Secretary.
Winnie E. Branstetter (Oklahoma).
Jasper M. Levy (Connecticut).
S. W. Rose (Mississippi).

A FEW OF THE BEST BOOKS ON THE COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR CITIES.

"City Government by Commission," by Ford H. MacGregor, Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin No. 423, paper, 40 cents, 151 pages with very complete bibliography.

"Commission Government in American Cities," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November, 1911, 300 pages, \$1.00.

"Commission Plan of Municipal Government," Debaters' Handbook Series, H. W. Wilson Co., cloth, 178 pages, \$1.00, very good presentation of arguments on both sides, complete bibliography.

"Commission Government in American Cities," by Bradford, McMillan Company, N. Y., cloth, \$1.25, 359 pages.

"City Government by Commission," by Woodruff, D Appleton & Co., cloth, \$1.50, 380 pages.

"A Comparison of the Forms of Commission Government in Cities," pamphlet by Bradford, reprinted from proceedings of the National Municipal League at Buffalo, 1910, 3025 15th street, N. W., Washington, D. C., 30 cents.

ON GENERAL MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.

"The City, the Hope of Democracy," by Frederick C. Howe.

"The British City," by Frederick C. Howe. (These two books by Howe are probably the most advanced view of the problems of municipal government, and will be most appreciated by Socialist readers.)

"Municipal Government in Continental Europe," by Shaw.

"Municipal Government in Great Britain," by Shaw.

COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR CITIES.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE.

At the National Convention of the Socialist party in 1910, a committee was appointed to submit to the convention a report on the subject of the commission form of government for cities, which by that time had begun to attract considerable attention throughout the country.

The committee gave such attention to the subject as was possible during the convention and submitted a tentative report. This first report can be found on pages 290-295 of the proceedings of the National Convention of the Socialist party for 1910.

After a discussion of the report, the convention unanimously decided to make the committee permanent with instructions to give further study to the subject and make report at the next convention of the party.

The tentative report of this committee to the National Convention of the party for 1912, follows:

1. THE EXTENT AND GROWTH OF THE COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

Up to the present time about 151 cities have adopted and are operating under the commission form of government in 29 different States. The list of the cities is rather too long to print in the report, but may be found in almost any publication on the subject. (See "Commission Government in American Cities," by Bradford, pages 131-138.) The States now having one or more cities under the commission form of government, are as follows:

Alabama.	Montana.
California.	New Mexico.
Colorado.	North Carolina.
Iowa.	North Dakota.
Illinois.	Oklahoma.
Idaho.	Oregon.
Kansas.	South Dakota.
Kentucky.	Tennessee.
Louisiana.	Texas.
Maryland.	Utah.
Massachusetts.	Washington.
Michigan.	West Virginia.
Minnesota.	Wisconsin.
Mississippi.	Wyoming.
New Jersey.	

Twenty-one States have passed general laws providing for the commission form of government in cities which chose to adopt the general provisions. These States are as follows:

Alabama.	North Dakota.
California.	New Jersey.
Idaho.	South Carolina.
Illinois.	South Dakota.
Iowa.	New Mexico.
Louisiana.	Texas.
Kansas.	Utah.
Kentucky.	Washington.
Montana.	Wisconsin.
Mississippi.	Wyoming.
Minnesota.	

Some of these States and certain others have a general home rule law which makes it possible for the inauguration of the commission form, which should be added to the above list, for in most of these home rule states the commission

form has been adopted by one or more cities. These States which may be called "home rule States," are California, Oregon, Michigan, Missouri, Oklahoma, Washington and Minnesota.

There are 59 cities operating under special charter in states where there is no general law as yet.

THE RATE OF GROWTH OF THE COMMISSION FORM. It is interesting to note that the commission form of government was first introduced in Galveston, Texas, in 1901. This was not only the first example, but it was also the first form. No other city adopted the plan and there was no further development till 1907. During that year six cities adopted the plan and a few States passed general laws. In 1908 seven more cities adopted the plan. In 1909 there were 26. In 1910 the high-water mark was reached. During that year 61 cities adopted the commission form of government. In 1911 only 49 cities adopted the form.

CITIES REJECTING THE COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

Meanwhile the number of cities rejecting the commission form of government seems to be increasing. In 1909, four cities voted upon and rejected the plan. In 1910 19 cities rejected the plan. In 1911, 33 cities rejected it.

It will be noted, therefore, that the rate of increase in the number of cities adopting the commission form of government reached its highest point in 1910, and dropped off in 1911, while the number of cities rejecting the plan beginning with 1909, has rapidly increased. One of the cities rejecting the plan, Bogalusa, Miss., has voted it down twice. Oklahoma City twice rejected the plan, but at a third referendum the plan carried.

SIZE OF CITIES ADOPTING THE COMMISSION FORM. It should also be noted that no large city has as yet adopted the commission form of government, although many of its advocates insist that it is as applicable to the large cities as well as to the small ones.

The largest city so far adopting the form is St. Paul, Minn., with 214,000, and Oakland, Cal., comes next with 150,174 population. Only three other cities of more than 100,000 population have adopted it, viz.: Spokane, Wash., Memphis, Tenn., and Birmingham, Ala. All the other cities that have adopted the form have a population of less than 100,000.

Furthermore there are only eleven cities of the 151 adopting the form, that have a population of between 50,000 and 100,000. In other words, 136 of the 151 cities adopting the commission form have a population of less than 50,000. One hundred and seven of the total number adopting the form have a population of less than 25,000 and 73 have a population of less than 10,000 and 40 a population of less than 5,000.

2. THE ESSENTIAL AND NON-ESSENTIAL FEATURES OF THE COMMISSION FORM.

While the form of the commission plan of government varies greatly and seems to be constantly changing, there are certain features which are presented by the writers on the subject, as being essential. Your committee, however, takes a somewhat different view of this point from most of the writers. Certain features are by some urged as essential to the commission form which it seems to us are not so at all. We therefore make a somewhat different division in the discussion of this

part than most of the writers on the subject. We think this necessary to a correct estimate of the commission form.

THE ESSENTIAL FEATURES. The following are what to us appear to be the essential features of the commission form.

(1) First and foremost is the concentration of the legislative, administrative and in most cases some of the judicial functions of the city government into the hands of one governing body. This concentration involves also the appointive power, as in most cases the heads of all subordinate departments are appointed by the commission. The extent of this appointive power, however, varies in the different cities and under the different forms.

This feature of the concentration of the various functions of the municipal government, constitutes the most constant and characteristic element in the commission form of government.

(2) The second most constant feature of the commission form is the small governing body generally of five men. In a few cases it is a smaller number and occasionally a somewhat larger number, but these are exceptional. There are a few cities that have seven commissioners and one or two that have nine. But the most common form is a board of commissioners of five members.

Thus the concentration of power and functions mentioned in the first point above, becomes by reason of this feature a concentration of power and functions into the hands of a very small number of men, generally five. This feature of a small body appears in every case.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the process of concentration has in one or two cases been carried beyond the idea of a board of five commissioners and has gone to the limit of proposing a single man to have complete charge of the city. This official is known as the city business manager. This was first inaugurated by the city of Staunton, Va., with a population of 12,000. The purpose in that case appears to have been to adopt the commission form of government with the addition of a single official to be known as "city manager." To him was given "entire charge and control of all the executive work of the city in its various departments and entire charge and control of the heads of departments and employees of the city." Under his direction are superintendents of (a) streets; (b) electric lighting; (c) water works; (d) city parks; (e) overseer of the poor. His duties are to make all contracts for labor and supplies and "in general perform all the administrative and executive work now performed by the general standing committees of the council, except the finance, ordinance, school and auditing committees."

A form of government under which a commission of five was to be elected, who in turn should appoint a municipal manager, has been proposed by Lockport, N. Y.

In Roswell, N. M., the city supervisor, who is appointed by the council, is really a "city manager."

Thus we have a concentration brought in this case to its logical conclusion of a single one man authority.

(3) The third most characteristic feature of the commission form is the elections at large. The principle of the election of representatives to the governing body of the city from wards and districts, is abandoned entirely and the commissioners are elected from the city at large. This

feature also appears in every case under the commission form.

(4) Another universal feature of the commission form is that each commissioner elected assumes charge of a certain department. The department which the commissioner takes charge of is generally determined by the commissioners themselves after they are elected. In a few cases, however, the commissioners are elected in the first place by the people as heads of certain departments. Having each commissioner at the head of a department, is, however, a universal feature of the commission form.

(5) The fifth but less universal feature is non-partisan elections. A little more than half of the cities operating under the commission form require non-partisan elections. In most cases the use of party names and party designations is entirely eliminated and occasionally this assumes a rather drastic form. In nearly one-half of the cases, however, this non-partisan feature is not insisted upon.

This constitutes what seem to be the most characteristic, and the essential features of the commission form.

3. THE NON-ESSENTIAL FEATURES.

In addition to the features mentioned above, most writers include certain others which they claim as part and parcel of the commission form. Among these are the initiative, the referendum, recall, civil service commissions, publicity and home rule.

None of these, however, can be claimed as essential parts of the commission form of government. There are cities, states and even nations that have put certain of these features into operation, that have had no commission form of government whatever.

For example, Switzerland and New Zealand have had the initiative and referendum in their national laws for many years. Many of the western cities had the recall long before the establishing of the commission form of government. The civil service provision is least of all an essential part of the commission form of government, as it had been advocated years before the commission form of government was heard of and put into operation very widely in various degrees throughout the world. And so far as publicity is concerned, there is a question whether there is more publicity under the commission form of government, with its small body of elected officers, than there is under the council form with its larger body and open meetings.

And as to home rule, it may be said that if the commission form of government to any considerable degree increased the right of self-government and home rule in cities, this in itself would constitute a very strong argument in its favor. The home rule movement, however, started long before the idea of the commission form of government arose, and has been widely agitated entirely apart from it. Moreover, before the commission form of government became at all widespread and quite independent of the commission movement, there were a number of states that came to be known as "home rule states." These are notably California, Oregon, Michigan, Missouri, Oklahoma, Washington and Minnesota, so that it is quite clear that we do not need to resort to a commission form of government as a means of securing home rule for cities. And while it may be admitted that in many cases the degree of home rule is somewhat increased under the commission form of government, the

home rule features cannot be claimed as an essential part of that form.

Whether as some of the opponents of the commission form of government argue, these non-essential features as we have called them, were hitched on to the commission form in order to deceive the people into voting for it or not, we need not at this time discuss. We should be able to distinguish, however, between those features of the commission form of government which come as a characteristic part and those which do not really belong to it and which can and are being secured by the cities quite widely entirely apart from the commission form of government.

That the initiative, referendum and recall are desired and urged by every socialist organization in the world, is well known. That home rule for cities is one of the foremost and most vital needs of all cities, not only in America but everywhere, is also well understood by every student of municipal problems. But all of these matters can be advanced and are being advanced apart from the commission form. They cannot therefore be held as characteristic of this form of government.

4. RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION FORMS.

TOO EARLY TO JUDGE. Considering the fact that the commission form of government has been in operation so short a time, it is too early to judge finally as to its efficiency or success. The only city that has really had enough years of experience to have given the form a real test, is Galveston, Texas, which adopted the form in 1901. But the Galveston form is so much different from what has come to be known as the commission form of government, and was inaugurated under such different circumstances and conditions from practically all of the other cities, that it can hardly be considered a test.

No other city adopted the form until four years later, when Houston, Texas, followed the example and copied much the same form as that of Galveston. Not until two years later, viz., in 1907, were there any considerable number of cities adopting the form of government.

So it will appear that the experience of any city under the commission form has been brief. Galveston has had the longest which is about eleven years. Houston comes next with nine years. Five other Texas cities, of which Dallas is the largest, and Lewiston, Idaho, have had about six years. Most of these cities in the early period of the commission form, have not yet developed the real form of commission government which is at present most commonly advocated.

Des Moines, Ia., which finally adopted the form most commonly advocated at the present time, has had hardly five years of experience. All of the other cities have had even less than that. Twenty-six of the cities have not yet completed two years of experience and forty-nine are still in their first year. In other words, none of the cities having the present form of commission government, most generally advocated, have had more than four or five years of experience, while the great majority of them have only had one or two years.

So it will appear that the commission form of government has not been in operation in any case more than four or five years and during that time the form has been constantly modified and changed so that it is really too early to be able to judge as to its results. The further fact that in no case has it been applied in any

city of considerable size, still further limits our opportunity for judgment as to its efficiency, so far as political results are concerned.

FAVORABLE AND UNFAVORABLE REPORTS. Turning now to the reports given out from the various cities as to the results of the operation of this form of government, we find a mass of literature, pamphlets and magazine articles, which attempt to present the results. Many of them report in most glowing terms the splendid results obtained. Almost every writer on municipal problems has had something to say upon this subject. Some socialist writers have strongly advocated the commission form. Most notable of these is Charles Edward Russell, whose article in "Everybody's Magazine" April, 1910, on "Sanity and Democracy for American Cities" is a most positive and unqualified endorsement of the idea. And the article which is written with special reference to Des Moines attempts to point out most remarkable and favorable results. Coming as it does from one of our prominent socialists, this article immediately challenged the attention of your committee. Correspondence with Comrade Russell drew out the fact that he was very decidedly of the opinion that the commission form of government was in every way worthy of the support of those who desire a better municipal government.

A contrary opinion, however, is held by other socialists and even by other writers with regard to Des Moines and the success of the form there.

In the case of the recent street car strike there the commissioner of public safety was undoubtedly in sympathy with the workers. As is usual in such struggles the company depended upon the support of the police to help them. When the strike breakers were brought in to operate the cars the company expected the police to give them special protection, and asked permission for their men to carry weapons. This the commissioner of public safety refused to permit.

The result was that inside of two days the strike was won and the union men were operating the cars.

Subsequently, and in absolute violation of the Iowa law, this particular commissioner was deprived of the control of the police force. He had control, by virtue of his office of both the fire and the police forces. When the crisis came the police force was taken away from him. This naturally brought forth vigorous protests from many quarters. In order to offset this, the whole department was taken away from this commissioner and given over to one of the others.

The feeling of the people was very decidedly manifested in the ensuing election when all three of the commissioners who had been parties to this high handed proceeding were defeated. And yet, in spite of all this, when the new commission took office they did not restore the commissioner who had shown his sympathy for the workers to the control of the police and fire department forces.

In Minot, North Dakota, we have another illustration of the peculiar workings of the commission form of government. One of our Socialists, Arthur LeSueur, was elected chairman of the commission. Another Socialist had also been elected and these two found that one of the other members worked and voted with them. This gave them the control of the commission. They proceeded then to enforce the laws and clean up the city. A little later on, however, one of the Socialist candidates

failed of re-election, another was compelled to leave town and the Socialists lost control of the commission. There were three non-Socialists against the two Socialists.

The commission law in this case made it incumbent upon the chairman particularly to enforce the laws relative to vice, gambling and the selling of liquor. The County Sheriff was particularly hostile to the chairman of the commission, Comrade LeSueur was therefore in this dilemma: the law required him to enforce the anti-gambling and anti-vice ordinances; the county officials who were hostile stood ready to prosecute him if he did not enforce them. But meanwhile the three members of the commission who stood against him had elected an entirely new police commission and they in turn had taken the police force out of his control. The law compelled him to enforce the ordinances, but the commission had taken away from him the power by which alone he could do it. In this predicament he appealed to the local of the Socialist party for a decision as what was best to do and they decided that the only thing in that case was for him to resign, which he did.

This would seem to us a clear indication of the bad working of this form of government, or at least an evidence that it is no better than the old form. In spite of this, however, Comrade LeSueur believes strongly in the commission form of government.

In 1907, the Polk County Republican Club, of Des Moines, appointed a committee that visited Galveston and Indianapolis, in order to make comparison of the forms of government there with the proposed Des Moines plan. This committee was evidently very much opposed to the Galveston plan. Their report was strongly against the commission idea. Speaking of the Galveston plan they say:

"It is a potentially perfect political machine. There has been no change in the membership of the Galveston commission since it was organized in 1903 (except on the death of a member). The extensive powers of the commissioners have enabled them to control all political factions and completely to crush the opposition. The commissioners' faction is in complete control, and its leaders dictate nominations of commissioners, members of the legislature and congressmen.

"The Galveston commissioners and city officials are not easily accessible to the citizens of the city, and give but a small portion of their time to the city's business. None of the commissioners, except the mayor, has an office in the city hall. All of them have other extensive interests and citizens seeking redress or assistance must run the gauntlet of the outside office and closed door of the private business office.

"In Houston, which also has a commission form of government where the commissioners are required to stay in the city hall every day, business men do not hold these positions although the salaries are higher than the proposed salaries of the Des Moines commissioners. One commissioner was formerly a scavenger, another a blacksmith, justice of the peace and alderman, a third a railroad auditor, a fourth a dry goods merchant, and the mayor a retired capitalist.

"The Galveston commissioners favor the corporation. The only franchise given to a corporation by the commission is the franchise obtained by the Galveston Street Railway Co. in May, 1906. It was not referred to a vote of the people. (This franchise was given for a period of fifty years.)

The city received no compensation for this franchise and collected no franchise taxes on it. The city receives no percentage of the gross or net receipts. The company charges a straight five-cent fare and transfers are issued only from May to October."

Speaking of this failure of the commission government in Galveston to provide in the franchises granted to the street car company for adequate protection to the people of the city, Mr. Starzinger (quoted in the hand book above referred to, page 123) says:

"In Galveston today, for instance, not one cent is derived from the existence of valuable franchises," and he asks indignantly, "Is this the superior legislation of which friends of the commission idea speak?"

Furthermore, according to these investigators, the Galveston municipal government is not free from graft. This is the most unkind cut of all, as the friends of the commission form have boasted most loudly of this most particular achievement. The committee refers to the Galveston police board records in proof of their contention that graft still prevails; and they cite similar instances in the city attorney's department.

Professor Rowe, in discussing the commission plan in the Debaters' Handbook above referred to, points out very clearly the fundamental issue involved. He says frankly that the choice presented to our American communities takes the form of an apparent opposition between democracy and efficiency. Very clearly therefore we are called upon here to sacrifice the principle of democracy in the interests of alleged efficiency. Prof. Rowe says:

"This means that the people are prepared to accept the same administrative standards in municipal affairs as those which prevail in the business world. The recent proposal to give the police commissioner of New York a term of ten years or possibly a life tenure, would have been received in scorn. Today it is regarded by many as the best possible means of securing an efficient administration of this service."

Here then we have the most direct objection to the commission form, the fact that it proposes not only extreme concentration, but that there is appearing already as a logical sequence the proposal for long term of office and finally even of life terms. And the fact that this is suggested with reference to the control of the police is particularly significant to a working class movement that is struggling for fairness in its struggle with an unprincipled plutocracy.

Finally it is argued against the commission plan that it has been tried in at least one case for fifteen years and found a failure. Hon. Clinton L. White, of Sacramento, Cal., writing of the form of government there, says that that city has tried the commission form for fifteen years and abandoned it in 1893. Speaking of the results of this experience in the commission form of government, he says:

"The management of the street department, the small amount of work accomplished with funds provided for the purpose and the number of employees doing only a nominal amount of work, but drawing full pay from the city were at times something simply scandalous. The management of the water works system was frequently almost as bad, and these things were not checked by a disinterested tribunal." (See Debaters' Handbook on "Commission Plan of Municipal Government," page 134.)

In view of these facts, Mr. White says the people of Sacramento abandoned the commission form, and have gone back to the usual form of municipal government, which he says has been very much superior to the commission system.

The experience of Boston with the non-partisan feature of the commission plan seems to have been unfavorable. At least an article in Pearson's Magazine by George P. Anderson, takes a decidedly critical view of the idea, and reports serious evils resulting from the new method of handling the city's civic life.

The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science for November, 1911, has a number of articles written by different men on "Objections, Limitations and Modifications of the Commission Plan." One of the writers, Dunbar F. Carpenter, of Colorado Springs, Colorado, reporting upon the operation of the commission form in that city, admits that it has been a disappointment to its friends and advocates. He says:

"We have not found it any more economical—there has been no saving in the cost of operation—there is cause for disappointment in the fact that the administration has not been more effective in the general management of the city's business, and the least efficient branch of the public service is what it always is in American cities, the police department."

He says further: "My observations lead me to believe that the commission plan is not the final solution of the great plan of municipal government. The commission plan is a long step over the old plan, but it is only a step and not the goal."

We refer to this testimony because it is given by one who proposes to be a friend to the commission form of government, and yet finds it disappointing.

The article in the same chapter by Walter G. Cooper of Atlanta, Ga., is also a very strong and rational presentation of the arguments against the commission form.

Ford H. McGregor, instructor in political science, University of Wisconsin, in his City Government by Commission, gives a rather strong argument on the "disadvantages" of the commission form of government, pages 115-129. In this there is perhaps the clearest recognition of the most fundamental objection. He says:

"But by far the greatest influence and the most dangerous influence exerted on the council or commission will come, not from political organizations, but from the great industrial interests. As has already been pointed out, one of the greatest evils connected with municipal government in the United States has been the corrupt dealings between the city governments and private corporations which desire valuable franchises for semi-public purposes. The interests of these corporations will be the same under the commission plan as under any other form of city organization, and we may reasonably expect that they exert the same pressure upon the members of the commission as they have in the past upon the members of the common councils to secure these valuable franchises. As a certain newspaper has put it: 'Will public service corporations that manage our city railways, our telephones and telegraphs, our water system, our heating and lighting plants, cease to covet gain, cease to look with designing eyes on the city council, cease to scrutinize the ordinances, and care not about the character of the men who will enforce the regulations affecting the conduct and individuals? Will the men interested in the sale of wine and beer and the

patrons of their saloons, will the keepers of dives and gambling dens, become converted and join the church and cease to trouble our souls and harass not the police who surround them? The inducements for such interests to control the commission will be even greater than ever, because of the increased power which is given to the commission. This is probably the greatest danger which confronts the commission plan. A corrupt or inefficient commission, with the great powers conferred upon it, would be much more dangerous to the best interests of the city than an equally corrupt or inefficient common council.

"Not only does the commission plan afford increased opportunity to the politician to manipulate city government, it also presents the possibility of the commission itself becoming a powerful political machine. The more absolutely power and patronage are concentrated, the greater the political force that can be wielded by the holders of them. A small commission exercising the entire power of the city might build up such a machine and so intrench itself that it could not be defeated."

From this it will appear that the testimony as to the results of the operation of the commission form of government are not all in one way. There is a feeling that on the whole there has been increased efficiency and some improvements. But the more enthusiastic supporters of the idea become so extreme in their efforts to show good results that their reports can hardly be trusted.

On the other hand there are those who hold that the improvements have been in no way commensurate with the risk involved in the experiment of greatly increased power in the hands of a few. They urge that the principle of democracy has been sacrificed to the promise of efficiency. And they go so far as to claim that the promise of efficiency has not materialized to any appreciable extent.

REPORT FROM THE SOCIALIST LOCALS. In order to learn directly from the localities where the commission form is in operation, and to get the views of the Socialists themselves, your committee addressed a circular letter to about 125 secretaries of locals in cities where the commission form of government is in operation. As there were only about 150 cities in all, as stated above, this circular letter was sent to a very large proportion of all the cities that have the commission form.

In response to this letter your committee received replies from 76 cities in 18 different States. The questions bore upon details relative to the form in operation in the various cities, the fact of which we have brought out in other parts of this report.

Among other things we inquired what attitude the Socialists in the community had taken regarding the commission form, whether they were in favor or opposed to it. In answer to this question, 13 locals reported that they favored the commission form of government. Twenty-seven locals reported that they were opposed to it. Nine others reported that they were in a general way opposed to the commission form. Four locals reported that they were divided among themselves, some favoring and some opposing it. Fifteen locals reported that the comrades of their community had taken no attitude whatever, one way or the other.

From this it will appear that there is no consensus of opinion among the Socialists of the country that refers to the com-

mission form. Some favor it, others oppose it and a good many seem not to have given it any study and therefore take no stand upon the matter.

Of those who favored the commission form of government, it was interesting to note that nearly all of the California locals reporting upon the subject were favorable. The State secretary of the Socialist party of California, Comrade F. B. Meriam, takes the pains to write at considerable length in favor of the commission form. He says:

"A pure commission government or a government where the citizens select a committee or council, leaving everything to them as everything is left to the board of directors of a corporation, is a government in favor of which from a Socialist standpoint, little can be said. But as to those cities where their officers are elected by the electors, where they have the initiative, referendum and recall and also where all partisan ballots are eliminated, very different conditions are presented for consideration. In a general way the latter represents the general type of the California municipal government of the new class.

"Most of the Socialists oppose the commission form because it eliminates partisan ballots, and are prolific in the predictions of dire calamity. Several of the California cities have been under this non-partisan form of charter for a number of years. San Diego adopted it at the close of the year 1908, holding its first election in the spring of 1909. The Socialists there gave the matter careful consideration and finally decided to support the proposition for certain well defined reasons. There is practically no intelligent Socialist in the city today who would change this if he could. The experience there and the experience throughout the State during the past year has all pointed in one direction and that is, to the benefit of the Socialist movement. It has in its practical operation resulted in a demoralization of the old party machine organizations; has largely eliminated the terror of the party whip; has a tendency to remove the influence of party prejudice and in almost every instance has resulted in forcing a clean cut, unbogged fight between the Socialists on the one side and all branches of capitalism on the other. It has brought out a clean cut issue of humanity against mammon. It has had no effect in the way of demoralizing Socialist organizations or in minimizing our party action and activities. In fact the Socialist party is the only party which has been able to preserve its party activities, with a result similar to the conflict between a thoroughly drilled and organized body of men and a disorganized body.

"The educational and propaganda value of these clear cut battles are tremendous. They enable us to show things up in their true light and make the usual flim-flamming of the public on immaterial issues next to impossible. What future experience may develop, of course, remains to be seen but under the usual form adopted in California so far as our experience goes up to the present time, we have certainly reaped a positive and decided advantage by the adoption of this form of municipal government. Just so soon as we are enabled to eliminate from our political contests the old suspicions, prejudices and bogie men which have been built up in each of the old parties against the other for the sole purpose of blinding their constituency as to the real issue, just so soon we will have entered upon the last short, sharp battle, which will result in victory for the Social-

ist party. When the issue is clean cut, man against money, we will soon land them. The elimination of partisan ballots in municipal affairs produces just this result."

Comrade Frank E. Wolfe, writing in addition to the answers to the questions, and speaking for the Socialist local of Sacramento, Cal., takes a similar attitude. He says:

"Study of conditions here and study of the charter has convinced me the commission form will be vastly better for the people and better for the Socialists.

"We have an excellent opportunity of achievement if we elect. The prospects are first-class. Even if we get but one man through, we will be able to put a dent in the old system. One man will give us one-fifth of the entire city government.

"In Los Angeles we are about to write a new charter. It will, doubtless, be based on the commission form. Socialists there are in much confusion on the question. I was not certain about it but I am now in favor of it there, and hope to get the comrades to approve it officially.

"This form shortens the ballot and gives us an opportunity to concentrate our fights."

The locals at Vallejo, San Obispo and Modesto, also report that their comrades favor the commission form of government.

On the other hand, as mentioned above, 27 locals reporting, state that their comrades are opposed to the commission form. The comrades in Flint, Mich., take an active stand against the commission form of government, and in their paper, "The Flint Flasher," published a number of articles against it. The local of Peoria, Ill., published a leaflet against the commission form of government, which was reprinted in the Chicago Daily Socialist on February 16, 1911.

Comrade James O'Neil prepared a leaflet against the commission form of government for the Indiana comrades, which was reprinted in the Chicago Daily Socialist on March 4, 1911.

Comrade Moulton, Secretary of the Haverhill, Mass., local, reports that the comrades there have taken a stand against the commission form of government and gives at some length the arguments which they hold against it. This will be referred to later.

In some cases the locals report controversies having arisen in their locals over the question of the commission form. This is notably true in Spokane, where factional division seems to have arisen over the election of Comrade David Coates as commissioner of public works, under the commission form. The comrades report that their local decidedly opposed the commission form of government, while Comrade Coates himself is an enthusiastic supporter. The local at Spokane complained that the elimination of the party lines enabled Comrade Coates to secure the election, which he could not have secured as a Socialist. The merits of the controversy, of course, your committee does not care to enter, simply calling attention to the fact that the local there is reported as strongly opposed to the commission form. Comrade Coates who has been elected under it strongly favored it, and a factional fight developed over the situation.

ARGUMENTS PRO AND CON, AS REPORTED BY THE SOCIALIST OFFICIALS.

The arguments in favor of the commission form of government, which the locals report as being most commonly used by the Socialists who favor it, are as follows:

Most common of all are the usual arguments that the commission form results in greater efficiency and promises more ready action. Another argument, less common, in its favor is that it results in greater economy.

We have already referred to the arguments submitted by Comrades Meriam and Wolfe, of California, referred to above. On the other hand the one and most constant objection urged against the commission form of government by practically all of the locals opposing it, is the concentration of power into the hands of a few, which they believe to be undemocratic and dangerous. In different forms and with many variations this seems always to be the most common objection.

Next to this the most constant objection raised is against the election at large which eliminates representation from the wards. This feature, it is argued, prevents the minority parties from securing any representation whatever in the governing bodies. It is pointed out that under the ward representation the working classes are sure to predominate in certain wards, and therefore are able to secure at least a minority representation if permitted to elect representatives from these wards. This gives them not only the advantage of having a working class representative in the governing body, but it also gives them the opportunity for experience in public service.

These two objections, the concentration of power and the elimination of ward representation, constitute the most universal arguments against the commission form as given by the secretaries of the branches replying.

5. OBJECTIONABLE FEATURES.

There are three principal objections to the commission form of government. There are many minor points that are objectionable but they are matters of detail.

(1) **EXTREME CONCENTRATION.** Extreme concentration of power is regarded by all critics of the commission form of government as its most dangerous and objectionable feature. Reducing the number of officials to five, the commission form combines the legislative, executive and judicial functions. It combines the tax levying, appropriating and expending powers. In addition it gives this small governing commission all of the appointive power including not only the right to appoint all municipal appointees but to remove them, to create new positions or discontinue them, to fix salaries and prescribe all official duties, alter or transfer them. Thus it not only gives this small group of five men almost complete control of the entire municipal affairs, but it also makes all of the city employees practically the agents and dependents of the commission.

This is concentration with a vengeance. Nothing of the sort has been attempted in modern times anywhere in the world. We have had in the past single rulers of cities and nations—kings, monarchs and emperors, and painfully and slowly through centuries of struggle the world has gotten away from monarchy and autocracy. We have had in ancient times dictators, triumvirates and decemvirates, but in modern times no nation on earth has proposed such a centralization of power. With the tendency of modern years everywhere in the direction of greater democracy, the commission form of government comes with a tendency back again towards the old idea of the rule by the few and power in the hands of the few.

In reply to this objection the friends of the commission form of government always urge that it has incorporated the initiative,

referendum and the recall, which are the instruments of modern democracy. It is doubtful, however, whether these features constitute a sufficient safeguard against the dangers of concentration. And besides there is reason to doubt the wisdom of so radical a departure from the democratic form of government as will compel the people to depend upon these devices as their only possible escape from the tyranny of autocracy.

Speaking of this point, J. R. Palda in a report to the Bohemian Independent Political Club of Cedar Rapids (quoted in Debaters' Handbook on "Commission Plan of Municipal Government," page 135) says: "The initiative referendum and recall are good provisions; in fact, the best the plan contains, but they will in no sense counter-balance the powers granted to the commission. It is a difficult defense against the possible misconduct and inefficiency of the commission, as it requires in the greater number of cases a petition signed by 25 per cent of the voters. Who will undertake the work, and who will pay the expenses of securing such a petition? That is worthy of consideration. Will it not occur to all that the people will tolerate many, many abuses from the honorable commission before they will reach out for these means of defense? That they will remain supinely silent for a long, long time before making use of the initiative, before they would avail themselves of the designated means of protest.

"Besides the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, which are the most salient features of the new plan, can very easily be incorporated into the present system, and it is not necessary in order to secure the benefits of those provisions to force upon the people the attendant dangers and burdens of the commission plan."

With the government of a great city in the hands of a few men with such unlimited power as the commission form gives them, it is doubtful whether the people would have at hand the necessary time, resource and means of publicity to contend with such a centralized, swift-acting power.

(2) THE NON-PARTISAN FALLACY. The elimination of parties is also a seriously objectionable feature. There can be no greater fallacy than the so-called non-partisan idea. Whether it be the mere stupidity of our so-called reformers or the clever design of politicians who seek to manipulate municipal government to their advantage, or a little of both, we can see no logical reason whatever for this non-partisan idea. Some seem to feel that if they can only eliminate "parties" in municipal affairs, everything will be lovely. In some cases this is carried to the extreme of prohibiting any kind of party designation whatsoever in a municipal campaign. Generally, however, the idea is to eliminate national parties from the local campaigns. And the line of argument advanced in favor of this is that the national parties have no issues that pertain to municipal affairs—that national affairs have nothing to do with local issues.

Little need be said with regard to the proposition that proposes to eliminate all party designations of every kind. Such a proposition would take out of civic life the responsibility of fighting together for principles. By eliminating all designations, by which people would work together for some principle or idea, municipal campaigns would be thrown back again upon the worst elements in our political life.

The experience of Boston with their non-partisan government is an illustration.

Speaking of the situation there, George P. Anderson, writing on "The First Result of Boston's Elaborate Political Reform," in Pearson's Magazine, says:

"The aim of the promoters of the new charter was to smash party lines and to break up party fealty. The charter accomplished this, but resulted in the injection of race and religious issues as substitutes. This is a most unfortunate result, but it is not wholly logical. In ordinary campaigns the candidate of a party stands for certain principles or traditions of that party. Take those away and the candidate's personality is bound to be the leading issue, and his race or religion cannot fail to be discussed. Which arrangement is better Boston knows to her sorrow. Other cities on the edge of a reform ferment, if they are wise, will pause before following her example."

And this is what might naturally be expected. The efforts to eliminate what is supposed to be the baneful influence of partisanship and the party, this non-partisan movement eliminates principle as well. And eliminating principle leaves nothing but personalities, race and religious prejudices as issues in municipal campaigns.

Against the elimination of national party names and national issues even more may be said. There is hardly a serious problem of municipal government that can be solved at all aside from the state and national movement. Take the question of home rule. Here in the very nature of the case the city is powerless in the hands of the state legislature. The fight for home rule itself is a state and national fight. Take the question of the commission form of government itself—it has been an issue for state legislatures very largely. Or to consider some of our commercial and industrial problems. The real difficulties that concern a people in a city, involve state and national issues. For example, the supply of coal for a city—what can any city in America do on a problem of that sort without state and national action? The city may establish a coal yard? But that is only the merest fraction of the problem. The coal must be shipped to the city over railroads that are owned by private corporations. It must be mined in mines that are owned by the monopolies and trusts. The transportation of the coal becomes a problem of interstate commerce. Thus the most elemental problem of the city becomes a state and national problem, a question requiring a consistent and comprehensive programme for state and national action. To undertake to solve problems of this kind by limiting our efforts to local issues, and separating our cities from state and national issues, is absurd.

It may be quite true that neither the Republican nor the Democratic national parties have anything in their platforms or programmes, looking to the relief of the people that live in cities. Perhaps they purposely omit any such ideas. That is doubtless a part of the plan of the fight of modern plutocracy, to keep the great political parties out of the most essential part of the fight. But to attempt to teach the people that they can find any relief from the evils that torment them without state and national action, is the height of folly. If the Republican and Democratic parties have no programme and no principles that apply to the great problem of municipal government, so much the worse for them. Let the people know it, the sooner the better. It is exactly what should be expected.

Such is not the case with the Socialist party. It has a programme—municipal, state and national. And they are a part of one consistent whole. The same principles for which the socialist party stands in the state and nation, apply with equal force, though with different details, to the city as well. And what is more, there is no solution of municipal problems apart from the principles of social democracy. And the principles of social democracy cannot be applied except through state and national action. The effort therefore to eliminate national and state issues and to prevent the organization of a state and national political party that shall have also a municipal programme, is to block the way to a final solution of the problems of municipal government.

Furthermore, let the Socialist party of America grow to sufficient strength and numbers; let it capture enough of the cities of this country, let it secure enough representatives in a few of the state legislatures and the national congress to make its municipal, state and national programme a real menace to the capitalistic parties of today, and we shall very quickly see the political powers of capitalism rush into a party that will be the most bitterly partisan that this country has known since the anti-slavery times.

There is an issue in municipal government that is bound up inseparably with the state and national programme. It is impossible to solve the municipal problems apart from these larger state and national problems. So the lines of this struggle may as well be drawn sharply and as closely as possible. We believe it to be the task of the Socialist party to bring this issue into the open and to make the people of this country realize that the struggle between plutocracy and the common people is not only a municipal struggle but a state and national one as well. And the effort to conceal this struggle by detaching the city and its issues and problems from the state and national situation, serves only to deceive the people and to prolong the period of their enslavement.

(3) ELIMINATION OF MINORITY REPRESENTATION. The elimination of minority representation is another serious objection to the commission form of government which is urged by all its critics. By abolishing ward representation and electing the commissioners at large, the possibility of a minority party securing a representation is destroyed. This is particularly true with regard to the working class. In the nature of the case certain wards in our cities are inhabited by the working class. Other wards are inhabited mostly by the capitalistic class. Under the method of ward organization there are sure to be some wards where the working class predominate and where therefore they are able to capture the city. This minority representation serves not only to give the working class a voice in the government to that extent, but it affords the working class experience in public affairs.

All of this is sacrificed by the commission form of government and we believe is a serious loss.

Furthermore the arguments in favor of representation at large is offset by arguments in favor of ward representation. For while it may be true that representatives from certain districts of the city will be inclined to neglect the general welfare of the city in their concern for their own constituency, yet on the other hand it is also true, particularly in larger cities, that the needs of a certain district are likely

to be overlooked by a form of representation that concerns itself solely with the general welfare of a city. The principle of ward representation has always been that in this way residents of a certain district are better able to bring the requirements of their district to the attention of the governing body. And this argument cannot be overlooked.

The cities which have combined a representation from wards with a group of aldermen elected at large, secure both of these advantages. We have such a form of municipal government in Milwaukee at the present time. The commission form of government sacrifices one of these advantages entirely.

(4) OTHER OBJECTIONS. In addition to the above, which are the chief and most serious objections, there are others which should not be overlooked. For example, whether intentional or not, there seems to have crept into many of the laws and charters providing for the commission form of government, features which can hardly be regarded other than as jokes. For example, in many cases the percentage required for the initiative, referendum and recall are so high as to practically destroy their value. The most notable case of this kind was the Illinois law which at first required a seventy-five per cent of the total vote in order to start a recall. Of course such a percentage is absolutely prohibitive. It should be said, however, that the next session of the legislature reduced that percentage to fifty-five, but even that is prohibitive.

In many of the cities twenty-five per cent and in some even thirty-five per cent of the voters are required for referendum. These are too high. The same may be said with regard to the initiative. Twenty-five and thirty per cent are frequently required and in one case the Kansas law required forty per cent in cities of the second class. (For analysis of this point see Commission Government in America, by Bradford, pages 220-233.)

It is also important to know that in many of the charters and many of the state laws, one or the other of these democratic devices have been omitted entirely. For example, thirteen out of fifty-one cities omitted the referendum entirely in their charters and seven states out of twenty-four omitted it from their general state laws.

Twelve cities have omitted the recall provision from their charters and eight out of the cities adopting a general commission law, have omitted the recall from the provision of their general acts.

5a. SOME OF THE CLAIMS INVESTIGATED.

DOES IT CONCENTRATE? In spite of the fact that the most characteristic feature of the commission form is its concentration of power and in spite of the fact that this is urged as the strongest argument in favor of the commission form it is interesting to note that in one or two respects it falls even at this point. For example, the school boards or boards of education are almost nowhere brought under the control of the commissions. So here is one other important part of the government in a city which is not concentrated.

But more important still, if concentration is to be considered an argument in favor of the commission form, is the fact that it does not concentrate the judicial power. While in many cases the municipal court is brought under the control of the com-

mission, this does not relieve the municipality of the interference of the courts where they may be hostile to the local government. And any student of municipal government, and particularly those who have been following the struggles of the cities that are trying to free themselves from the grip of the corporations, understand how serious the power of the courts is. Wherever a city has made a really serious stand against the domination of the interests the capitalistic courts have immediately swung into line against the local government. In the city of Cleveland, Ohio, for example, this went so far that in order to defeat Tom L. Johnson in his fight for the three-cent fare, which he had practically won, the matter was taken to the Supreme Court of the state and the charter of the city itself declared unconstitutional. And in this way the city was beaten by the courts. Similar experiences could be cited in scores of cases.

It is well understood and perfectly natural that the capitalistic courts should be everywhere the last resort of the corporate interests. If we are to secure an independent and free local government for a city we shall have to find some way of preventing the courts from overthrowing the acts of the local government through injunction proceedings and the like. And after all this is one of the most serious problems for the student of municipal government. And the commission form does not meet it in any sense of the word. In fact it does not contemplate it.

The freedom of action on the part of the municipal government by means of concentration of power, the commission form of government breaks down at this point.

DOES IT FIX RESPONSIBILITY? It is also argued that by concentrating the power of a municipal government in the hands of a few we are able to fix the responsibility, to know exactly who is to blame if things do not go right.

How far is this true? A commission is elected, let us say, five men. The question of a certain line of action is decided by a majority vote. One of the commissioners who is at the head of a department, decides upon a certain line of action. Three of the five, however, vote against it. The work cannot be done.

Who now is to blame for the failure of the commission to act?

The commissioner who proposed the action did his part. He lays the blame upon the others. But the neglected work is in his department, so the others shift the blame on to him.

Another illustration of the shifting of responsibility occurred in Oklahoma City. A circuit judge was elected as one of the commissioners because of his known friendly attitude toward union labor. When he was elected he was put at the head of the Department of Public Works. But when the question of engaging union labor came up he dodged the issue and shifted the responsibility by referring the question to the commission. The commission then decided that they could not under the laws "discriminate against" the non-union workers. In this way the labor question was shifted from one commissioner to the other and so disposed of.

Again in Des Moines the citizens circulated a petition asking for the submission of the question of the purchase of the street car system. The signatures of 16 per cent of the voters were secured. Now, the commissioners did not want to submit the question. On the other hand, they did not wish to offend the 2,300 voters who had

signed the petition. So they shifted the responsibility by referring the question to the legal department. The city attorney gave them an opinion in which he held that the form of the ordinance was illegal. In spite of the opinion of the legal department the commissioners decided to submit the question to a vote of the people, after which the district court at the instigation of the street railway company intervened, restraining the commission from submitting the question. But they again shifted the responsibility from the city attorney's shoulder and in spite of his opinion submitted the question. Then the district court stepped in upon the petition of one of the citizens and issued an injunction restraining the commission from submitting the question.

Thus, we have in this case the shifting of responsibility first from the shoulders of the commission to those of the city attorney; back again from the shoulders of the city attorney to those of the commissioners; and finally again from their shoulders to those of the district court. It would be pretty hard to conceive of a better illustration of the failure of the commission form of government to "fix responsibility."

From this it would appear that so long as you have more than one in your commission, there is more or less shifting of responsibility inevitable. And hence the arguments actually made in favor of a one-man commission.

And even more serious is the interference of State legislatures and courts. The establishment of the commission form of government in a city does not take away the possibility of interference by the legislature and the courts. So long as the administration of the city is in harmony in its purposes and policies with the State legislature and the courts, so long matters may go smoothly. But let any city administration undertake to withstand the capitalistic policies of the courts and the State legislature and there soon is a manifestation of these superior powers. It only requires one man in a city to apply to the courts for an injunction. And the dominant political party in the State legislature when controlled by capitalistic influences, can be very quickly swung into opposition to the city administration. When this happens, as it is constantly happening, will not then the responsibility be shifted again? When a commission in such a case attempts or even proposes to do something for the people of a city, may it not very easily shift the responsibility for not having succeeded either on to the courts or the State legislature?

So it is evident that the commission form does not wholly solve the problem of "fixing the responsibility."

With the Socialist party this question is a very simple one. The party itself assumes and wishes to carry the responsibility for the handling of any degree of political power that is given to its representatives. If any of the men elected by the party fail to make good, let it count against the party. Why should not other organizations and parties assume the same responsibility? And why should they not stand or fall as the Socialist party proposes to stand or fall upon the record that it makes.

In this connection it seems to us that the commission form of government has a serious weakness. Having destroyed entirely parties and party organizations, there is no one that can be held responsible for what the elected officers do. In this sense the commission form of government makes it

slon form of government. And they have than less, and this phase of the matter should be considered.

IS IT MORE EFFICIENT? Another claim of the commission form of government that should be investigated is, the claim put forward by all of its advocates that it greatly increases efficiency of the with regard to certain matters. A great deal has been written and said by the friends of the commission form along these lines. When we come to examine the details upon which this claim is based, however, the argument does not seem to carry so much weight.

It may be frankly admitted, for the sake of argument, that the cities that have adopted the commission form of government, have shown evidences of improvement.

For example, it is claimed for certain of the commission governed cities that they have greatly reduced the burden of taxation by economies effected. But hundreds of cities have accomplished things of that sort without being under the commission form of government. It is always the boast of a new administration that it has reduced the taxes. And most capitalistic campaigns in the cities are waged on the promise to reduce the taxes.

Furthermore, low taxes may not be an evidence of efficiency of city government at all. On the contrary, a partial increase of the tax burden may be an absolute essential in the first steps towards an efficient city. Practically every American city is lacking in school facilities, in proper street equipment, parks and boulevards, sewerage and the like. To bring these up to the standard of efficiency shown by European cities will naturally and inevitably require increased expenditures. But what is much more vital than this even, the American city is far behind the cities of every progressive nation in the world in the matter of the ownership of revenue producing enterprises. If the American city is to be made efficient in the true sense of the word, it will be compelled to deliberately assume the policy which the European city long ago assumed, viz., in investing in revenue producing enterprises—water works, gas plants, lighting plants, street car system and all other public utilities, and especially land and sites. But every step in this direction involves, of course, an initial investment. And while the gradual introduction of this policy will enable the cities to use revenues produced by one utility in instituting the public ownership and operation of the next, it is nevertheless difficult, if not impossible, to inaugurate this programme without some increase in the tax burden. And yet there is no more essential feature, no more vital element in the efficiency of city government than this.

So the mere matter of reduced taxes cannot be taken as any evidence of efficiency. Other matters enter for consideration.

Again it is claimed that the commissions in certain cities have introduced more business-like methods in the municipal accounting. But scientific budget making is being developed on a much larger scale and in a much more thorough-going way in such cities as Chicago, New York and Milwaukee, than in any of the commissioned governed cities. So this can hardly be claimed as an evidence of increased efficiency. The achievements of a purchasing department, of a bureau of efficiency and economy are also urged as evidences of greater efficiency. But these details have also been established in many cities without the commis-

more difficult to fix the responsibility rather than equally good records.

In short, it is difficult for the advocates of the commission form of government to point out specific instances of increased efficiency under their commission, that has not been equalled somewhere in other cities that are not under the commission form.

In view of these facts, too much weight cannot be permitted to the claims made by the advocates of the commission form. While it may be admitted that there have been some gains, they do not all stand to the credit of the commission form of government as to mere form.

6. EXPERIENCE IN OTHER COUNTRIES. The commission form of government, as has already been pointed out, is not the result of a careful or comprehensive study of the problems of municipal government. It seems rather to have been stumbled upon and had its inception in an accident—the calamity at Galveston. It seems strange that the students of municipal government in America should not have come forward long before this, with some carefully prepared plan of municipal reform, based upon a thorough investigation of the subject in this and other countries. It is not to be expected, of course, that America should copy the forms of municipal government found in other countries; but it would be the height of folly for the people of this nation to disregard entirely the experience of other lands in the matter of municipal government, especially in view of the fact that other countries have made such notable achievements in that line. But this seems to be exactly what the advocates of the commission form of government have done. They have overlooked entirely and disregarded the experience of other nations.

(1) **THE GERMAN FORM OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.** Without doubt the best governed cities in the world, and particularly the most efficient, are the cities of Germany. While of course the Socialists of this country would by no means advocate the election forms of the German cities, it is interesting to note that in those particular respects in which the commission form of government is said to excel, the German cities have long ago made their greatest achievements. The German municipal government is efficient. And as compared to the American cities, they are decidedly progressive as well.

These things—efficiency and progressiveness, have been achieved in the German cities, not under the commission form of government, but quite the opposite. The general form of city government in Germany is that of a large council. There are 128 members of the city council of Berlin; Breslau has 100; Dresden 70. The councilmen are also elected from the wards or districts, and these in turn elect the heads of departments. These latter constitute a second body, handling in general the administrative affairs of the city. In addition to these two bodies are numerous commissions, part of them salaried and part of them rendering services without pay. The council selects the mayor, who need not be, and generally is not, a resident of the city, but is selected solely for his efficiency, ability and knowledge of municipal problems. The heads of the departments are also selected in a similar way and serve for long terms, sometimes for life.

Now, whether this form of government be better than the usual council form in America or not, one thing is certain—this, and not the commission form, is the one

under which the German municipal government has reached its high degree of efficiency.

If the form of government has anything to do with it, then the experience of Germany is against the commission form of government.

(2) **THE ENGLISH FORM OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.** The experience of England is somewhat similar to that of Germany. Prior to 1835 the English people had their problems of political corruption and municipal misrule, similar to those we have in America at the present time. Then came the municipal reform act, which, while it did not change the form of their government materially, nevertheless produced a profound effect for the better upon municipal government in England until today probably the next best governed cities in the world to those of Germany are the English.

Here again it is not the commission form of government under which efficiency has arisen, but quite the opposite. The council is a large body. Glasgow has 77 members; Manchester 124; Liverpool 134. They are also elected as in Germany from the various wards. And besides politics are not excluded from municipal government as is proposed by advocates of the commission form. There are generally two or three councilmen from each ward. This elected council then selects a second body one-third as large as the elective council. These two houses working together select the mayor, usually from their own membership. But the mayor has little power in the English city. These two bodies also select all other city officials.

Thus the English experience further disproves the contention of the advocates of the commission form of government, that only by the abolition of ward lines and the election of the small body at large, can efficient municipal government be attained. The English cities are well governed and have been well governed for nearly three generations. Moreover, the English city government is comparatively free from graft in spite of the fact that almost universally the cities own and operate large and important public utilities and employ thousands of men and spend millions of dollars every year.

And this has been accomplished, not under the commission form of government, but quite the opposite.

(3) **THE FRENCH FORM OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.** The municipal code of France permits the cities to choose their council either at large or by wards. The majority of the smaller cities elect their council at large, but most of the larger ones have chosen the ward plan. The elections are not non-partisan, nor are majority elections required. The council here as in Germany and England selects the administrative organizations. Nor is the council a small body as proposed by the commission advocates. The average for the ordinary French city is at least thirty-six.

In the French city the council elects the mayor who is a much more responsible official than the burgomaster in Germany and much more so than the mayor in England. He appoints all city officials except the treasurer and a few other important officers which are filled by the national government. His appointments are not even subject to the ratification of a council and he can remove any official except those of the police department.

Thus the experience of these countries in which the highest degree of efficiency of municipal government has been attained,

affords no encouragement to the idea of the commission form. On the contrary, whatever efficiency has been attained in these countries has been attained by a movement in the opposite direction.

7. DESIRABLE FORMS AND FEATURES OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.

In connection with the commission form of government are a number of features which all must agree are desirable. This fact requires discrimination in stating the position which the socialist party should take. If the party either locally or otherwise takes a stand against the commission form of government unqualifiedly, it thereby puts itself in opposition to certain desirable features that have been attached to the commission form. It is necessary therefore to study carefully the form and the various features of each particular city charter and the general state act as it comes forward. The attitude that the party is to take in any city or state can be determined by the particular form and the specific features of the commission form proposed.

(1) **HOME RULE.** Wherever the general state acts establishing the commission form of government proposes a greater degree of home rule than the cities in that state already enjoy, the party will have to consider seriously whether such a law even though objectionable in some other features, will not be to the advantage of the cities in the state. Above almost everything else, home rule and the right of self-government, the right of the city to manage its own affairs, is most important. Especially in the fight for municipal ownership, for direct employment, for trades union conditions of labor, the union label, the union scale, the eight-hour day and union conditions, home rule is essential.

Many of the commission charters, so far as we can discover, do not add one iota of home rule to the city's power. Many of the states have secured home rule entirely apart from the commission form and we believe the rest of the states would in time secure the same. Where the cities do not yet enjoy home rule, and the state law establishing the commission form does give the city more home rule, there the party should consider seriously whether it is not better to support the commission form on that account. And this will have to be determined in each case by a careful and discriminate estimate of the degree of home rule secured, and the question of whether there are other objectionable features that overbalance the possible advantages of the home rule involved.

(2) **THE INITIATIVE, REFERENDUM AND RECALL.** The Socialist party everywhere, of course, is seeking to establish direct legislation and greater control by the people over the government. The initiative, referendum and recall are means to that end. They are proposed in connection with the commission form in the great majority of cases. Here, again, the party will have to exercise discriminating judgment in determining its attitude.

Some matters are clear, however. Where any of these forms are missing in the proposed charter or State law, there the party should make a vigorous fight to have them included. And where the percentages are too high, the party should fight for their reduction. In our opinion the initiative should not require the signatures of more than ten per cent of the voters; the referendum should not require more than fifteen per cent and the recall should not require more than twenty per cent. These figures,

however, are arbitrary but are the figures that are coming to be regarded by the friends of direct legislation as being nearest the desired point. The percentages should not be so high as to make the devices too difficult of putting into operation, nor should they be so low as to interfere with the efficient operation of the municipal government.

(3) **SIZE OF THE GOVERNING BODY.** In the smaller cities, the five members proposed by the commission form are doubtless sufficient. It is desirable to keep the forms of government as simple as the situation will warrant. But in the larger cities, we do not believe the small body of five men is sufficient to insure efficiency. We do not agree with the contention put forth by most advocates of the commission form, that there should be such a sweeping reduction of the number of elected officials and increase of the number of appointive officials as would be involved by the change of form of government in a large city of say 400,000 population or more, from the present council and mayor form of government, to that of a commission form. For the large cities, your committee would recommend a modification of the present form of municipal government, drawn from the best experiences of European and American cities in this respect rather than the commission form.

(4) **SALARIES.** One good feature of the commission form of government is the fact that it generally provides for a salary for the elected commissioners and large enough to attract men of capacity into the public service and to enable them to devote their entire time to it. This we believe to be essential. Without salaries for public officials, the working class can hardly ever hope to take any part in civic life. The necessity of earning a living and the difficulty attendant thereto makes it impossible for them to devote their time to the public service. The failure to provide salaries, therefore, results either in office holding becoming the special privilege of the wealthy class, or it deteriorates into something worse. The provision of adequate salaries we believe to be an essential feature of municipal government.

(5) **SELECTING THE HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS.** One serious and objectionable feature of most of the commission form charters and laws is the fact that the five commissioners are elected without any reference to the work that they are to perform and are allowed afterwards to decide among themselves which men are to be put at the head of the five respective departments. A few of the commission charters, however, have remedied this defect. This is notably the case of the Grand Junction, Colorado, charter, which is perhaps on the whole one of the best. Under

the usual form, the five most popular candidates might be elected as commissioners and all of them be well qualified to fill one or two of the offices of heads of departments, while no one might be elected who is qualified to fill the others. The people are better able to determine the fitness of a man for a certain office than are the commissioners by trade and wire pulling after election.

It seems strange that the Grand Junction form should not have been insisted upon in more of the charters. There can be no justification for the plan by which the commissioners are allowed to select the offices for themselves after they are elected.

IN CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, the study of the movement for the commission form of government for cities in America reveals the fact that the forms proposed vary greatly in detail. Indeed, there is a great variation even in essential features. Furthermore, the form itself has been passing through the process of modification since its inception. This change and modification is still going on. There has not yet been proposed a final and definite form of the commission form of government; the whole matter is in process of development.

In view of these facts, it is impossible at the present time, we believe, to lay down or to fix any definite policy that shall apply equally to all the states and all of the cities with reference to this matter. Certain general principles may be stated. Certain errors and fallacies of the arguments may be pointed out, certain evils opposed. And where the form is entirely objectionable, it may be defeated.

In some cases the Socialist party organizations have already used their influence against certain objectionable forms and defeated them. In other cases they have compelled a modification of the form by insisting on the introduction of certain features that had been omitted. And so far as your committee can see, this discriminating attitude, varying with the conditions that concern the party in different localities, and varying as the movement varies, will have to be the position of the party.

One thing, however, your committee would recommend, viz., That a committee be appointed by the convention to study further the best forms of municipal government and to submit the results of their work as a basis for a form that may be proposed as an alternative and improvement upon the commission plan.

Respectfully submitted,

J. J. JACOBSEN (Ia.), Chairman,
CARL D. THOMPSON (Wis.), Secretary,
WINNIE E. BRANSTETTER (Okla.),
JASPER M'LEVY (Conn.),

Committee.

APPENDIX D

Report of Farmers' Committee.

During the decade just passed agriculture in America has entered upon a new stage of evolution, which both in direction and velocity of movement differs sharply from that of previous years. The causes of this change are several.

1. Free land has disappeared and the value of that now under cultivation is increasing more rapidly than ever before. From 1900 to 1910 this increase amounted to over 100 per cent for the entire nation. In the upper Mississippi valley, in so far as the census statistics are available, it appears that the value of the average farm is now about \$15,000. (In Illinois, \$15,505; in Iowa, \$17,259.) This is a sum fully equal to that which now separates the average wage worker from ownership in the tools of his industry, and indicates that from now on the landless farmer must surrender all hope of ever entering the class of farm owners.

2. That the conclusion drawn above is correct is borne out by the fact that in the three states of Indiana, Iowa and Illinois (the only ones in this locality from which the census data is available) the total number of farms has decreased from 714,670 in 1900 to 684,410 in 1910. The agricultural counties of these states, almost without exception show an absolute decrease in population, a still further proof of the same facts.

Still another fact leading to the same conclusion that the class of small farm owners is disappearing is the census statement that in these three states the number of farms of between 20 and 100 acres in area has absolutely decreased, while those of less than ten acres and of more than 175, show the most rapid rate of increase. This fact is indicative of the two forms in which agricultural concentration is operating: through the formation of intensively cultivated, artificially heated and wage-worker operated suburban market gardens, and large mechanically cultivated farms.

Perhaps more important than any of the above facts as showing the growing separation of the farmer from the land is seen in the remarkably accelerating rate at which farm tenantry is progressing. The census bulletins show that in the three states of Indiana, Iowa and Illinois, 30 per cent, 38 per cent and 41 per cent of all farms are now operated by tenants. Independent research shows that in the purely agricultural sections the actual average is over 50 per cent in these states. The situation in the South is even more striking. Here the census figures show that from 45 per cent to 66 per cent of all farms are operated by tenants, while investigation of the cotton farming districts (the overwhelmingly dominant agricultural industry) shows that fully 80 per cent of the cotton farms are operated by tenants, whose con-

dition is far below that of the average factory wage-worker.

The land is not the only instrument essential to agricultural production whose ownership by the producer is growing more difficult. The cost of farm machinery and the animals necessary for cultivation where animal power is used is also increasing rapidly. With the introduction of other than animal power, which is now progressing at a most revolutionary rate, this cost will soon render these instruments also far beyond the reach of the farm worker. Along with this goes the multiplication of subsidiary industries performing operations hitherto performed upon the farm, or which are immediately essential to agriculture, but the machinery for which are completely out of the ownership of the farmer. Such are sugar beet factories, canning factories, packing houses, alfalfa mills, cotton gins, rice mills, etc.

The workers affected by these conditions reached a total of more than ten million in 1910, and constitute by far the largest number embraced in any single branch of industry. To confess ourselves unable to include these in the program of Socialism is to surrender our position as the political representative of the working class.

Of these ten million, 3,933,705 are still farm owners, and in spite of all the tendencies mentioned above this group increased over a quarter of a million in the last ten years, a greater increase than is to be found in any other single group of industrial workers, with the single extremely significant exception of the group of farm tenants, which added a little over 320,000 to its numbers during the same period, and which now includes 2,349,245 workers.

Far larger than either of these divisions is that of agricultural laborers, of which there were nearly four million in 1910. It is significant, however, that these are located geographically, in sections largely apart from the other classes. So far as the census data is available it appears that nearly twice as much money is spent for agricultural labor in the little county of Cook, in which the city of Chicago is located, than in any other county in the United States. In so far as farm laborers are employed either upon the highly capitalized and intensively cultivated gardens and green houses or upon large capitalistically organized ranches, fruit farms, and mechanically operated farms in general, their problem is not distinctively different from that of other wage-workers save that hitherto the difficulties of propaganda, education and organization among them have been greater than among other classes of wage-workers. There are, however, certain definite steps (some of which are indicated in the program presented) which can be taken by a Socialist administered local or

APPENDIX

state government that will assist them in their struggle.

The extent of the problem, the complexity of the factors involved and the rapid changes that are now taking place in agriculture all emphasize the necessity of closer study of this problem and the need of the preparation of literature especially fitted to this field, and the committee would lay especial stress upon the urgent need of the preparation of literature and its extensive circulation.

As measures particularly suited to meet this problem we would recommend the adoption by the convention of the following program as indicating the lines of work to be pursued by a working class government for the especial relief of this largest division of that class:

PROPOSED FARMERS' PROGRAM.

1. The Socialist party demands that the means of transportation and storage and the plants used in the manufacture of farm products and farm machinery, when such means are used for exploitation, shall be socially owned and democratically managed.

2. To prevent the holding of land out of use and to eliminate tenantry, we demand that all farm land not cultivated by owners shall be taxed at its full rental value, and that actual use and occupancy shall be the only title to land.

3. We demand the retention by the national, state or local governing bodies of all land owned by them, and the continuous acquirement of other land by reclamation, purchase, condemnation, taxation or otherwise; such land to be organized as rapidly as possible into socially operated farms for the conduct of collective agricultural enterprises.

4. Such farms should constitute educational and experimental centers for crop culture, the use of fertilizers and farm machinery and distributing points for improved seeds and better breeds of animals.

5. The formation of co-operative associations for agricultural purposes should be encouraged.

6. Insurance against diseases of animals and plants, insect pests and natural calamities should be provided by national, state or local governments.

7. We call attention to the fact that the elimination of farm tenantry and the development of socially owned and operated agriculture will open new opportunities to the agricultural wage-worker and to that extent free him from the tyranny of the private employer.

8. The Socialist party pledges its support to the renters and the agricultural wage workers in their attempts to organize to protect themselves from the aggressions of capitalism and the employers in agriculture.

While the above is offered as a general outline for the National Agricultural Program of the Socialist party, we wish to point out that there are such variations of conditions in the widely separated districts of the United States that to each section and to each state must be left the task of working out the further details of a program applicable to the peculiar agricultural conditions in their respective states and districts.

A. M. SIMONS, Chairman,
A. LEE,
OSCAR AMERINGER,
CARL D. THOMPSON,
JAMES H. MAURER,
CLYDE J. WRIGHT,
Committee.

APPENDIX E

Report of Committee on Co-operative Movement.

(Adopted by the Convention.)

Just as the labor unions fight for industrial self-control for the working class, the Socialist party for political self-control, and the labor and Socialist press for intellectual self-control for the workers, so the co-operative movement fights for an increasing degree of economic self-control for the workers through the ownership and use of industrial and commercial capital by organized groups of the workers.

The development and successful operation of the co-operative movement in connection with the international labor movement is an historical fact, which cannot be disputed. While in some countries it may seem for the time being to have checked other lines of working class activity, it seems to be true also that "the economic power of a class at a given stage of development turns into political power."

The value of the co-operative movement to the working class has been recognized by the Socialist party, though reluctantly at first. It was recently so recognized at the Copenhagen congress in 1910, the American delegates voting for the resolution.

Following the path of other national organizations of the Socialist party, the Socialist party of America must recognize the fact of the existence on the American continent of a successful co-operative movement, though it has not as yet been brought into any unified form.

Your committee has not been able to gather any adequate data, but is informed, from the personal knowledge of those who came before the committee, of distributive co-operatives doing a total business of not less than twenty million dollars a year, in only a few of the states of the Union. Nearly one thousand local organizations are within the knowledge of those reporting these facts to your committee, which are operating successfully.

That there is still room within the developing processes of the capitalist system in this country for the inauguration and building up of a strong and successful co-operative movement, is evident from the facts already adduced, especially in view of other and as yet unverified statements which are nevertheless largely of common knowledge.

The benefits claimed by those most closely connected with the international co-operative movement are three-fold, and relate to:

1. The furnishing of an improved quality of food and other supplies to the co-operators;

2. The actual increase of the economic resources of the co-operators, through the control of their own purchasing power, and the building up of reserve funds which have been of great service to the industrial and political arms of the labor movement;

3. The training of members of the working class in the processes of industrial and commercial administrative work, and developing this new capacity among them, thus proving that it is possible not only to do without the capitalist's capital but also to do without his alleged superior intelligence.

The most successful co-operatives in America seem to be among the groups of foreign-speaking workers of the same nationality, who furnish a community highly homogeneous, having similar habits and customs of life; and among the farmers, who find it possible to combine at once their buying and selling powers in the same organization.

In view of the failures which have occurred in this and other countries in connection with the efforts to establish co-operatives, we recommend that a committee of five persons be elected by this convention, not confined to delegates in the convention, who shall be given the assistance of the national office in making an investigation into the facts concerning the co-operative movement; the committee to make a special effort to ascertain what bearing the degree of industrial development and organization in any particular locality has upon the operation of co-operation in that locality; to make tentative reports from time to time through the national office and the party press; and to make a final report at the next national convention.

W. R. GAYLORD, Wisconsin.

MRS. E. D. CORY, Washington.

CALEB LIPSCOMB, Missouri.

J. T. CUMBIE, Oklahoma.

LEE LANG, Iowa.

E. E. POWELL, Ohio.

Committee.

APPENDIX F

Report of Committee on Labor Organization and Their Relation to the Party.

ADOPTED BY THE CONVENTION.

Political organization and economic organization are alike necessary in the struggle for working class emancipation. The most harmonious relations ought to exist between the two great forces of the working class movement—the Socialist Party and the Labor Unions.

The labor movement of the United States has of recent years made marvelous progress in all directions. It has steadily increased in numbers and has reached trades and industries which were before unorganized. It has in many instances concentrated its power and increased its efficiency by the amalgamation of related trades into federations and industrial unions. Many unions have opened their meetings and journals to the discussion of vital social and political problems of the working class, and have repudiated the demoralizing politics represented by the National Civic Federation. The organized workers are rapidly developing an enlightened and militant class-consciousness.

The reality of this progress is attested by the increasing virulence with which the organized capitalists wage their war against the union. This improved economic organization is not a matter of abstract theory, but grows out of the experience of the wage workers in the daily class struggle. Only those actually engaged in the struggle in the various trades and industries can solve the problems of form of organization.

The Socialist party therefore reaffirms the position it has always taken with regard to the movement of organized labor:

1. That the party has neither the right nor the desire to interfere in any controversies which may exist within the labor union movement over questions of form of organization or technical methods of action in the industrial struggle, but trusts to the labor organizations themselves to solve these questions.

2. That the Socialists call the attention of their brothers in the labor unions to the vital importance of the task of organizing the unorganized, especially the immigrants and the unskilled laborers, who stand in greatest need of organized protection and who will constitute a great menace to the progress and welfare of organized labor, if they remain neglected. The Socialist party will ever be ready to co-operate with the labor unions in the task of organizing the unorganized workers, and urges all labor organizations, who have not already done so, to throw their doors wide open to the workers of their respective trades and industries, abolishing all onerous conditions of membership and artificial restrictions. In the face of the tremendous powers of the American capitalists and their close industrial and political union the workers of this country can win their battles only by a strong class-consciousness and closely united organizations on the economic field, a powerful and militant party on the political field and by joint attack of both on the common enemy.

3. That it is the duty of the Party to give moral and material support to the labor organizations in all their defensive or aggressive struggles against capitalist oppression and exploitation, for the protection and extension of the rights of the wage workers and the betterment of their material and social condition.

4. That it is the duty of the members of the Socialist party who are eligible to membership in the unions to join and be active in their respective labor organizations.

OSCAR AMERINGER,
TOM CLIFFORD,
JOB HARRIMAN,
TOM HICKEY,
ALGERNON LEE,
TOM J. LEWIS,
JAMES H. MAURER,
WILLIAM E. RODRIGUEZ,
DAN A. WHITE, Committee.

APPENDIX G

Report of Platform Committee as Revised and Adopted by the Convention.

The Socialist party declares that the capitalist system has outgrown its historical function, and has become utterly incapable of meeting the problems now confronting society. We denounce this outgrown system as incompetent and corrupt and the source of unspeakable misery and suffering to the whole working class.

Under this system the industrial equipment of the nation has passed into the absolute control of a plutocracy which exacts an annual tribute of hundreds of millions of dollars from the producers. Unafraid of any organized resistance, it stretches out its greedy hands over the still undeveloped resources of the nation—the land, the mines, the forests and the water-powers of every state in the union.

In spite of the multiplication of labor-saving machines and improved methods in industry which cheapen the cost of production, the share of the producers grows ever less, and the prices of all the necessities of life steadily increase. The boasted prosperity of this nation is for the owning class alone. To the rest it means only greater hardship and misery. The high cost of living is felt in every home. Millions of wage-workers have seen the purchasing power of their wages decrease until life has become a desperate battle for mere existence.

Multitudes of unemployed walk the streets of our cities or trudge from state to state awaiting the will of the masters to move the wheels of industry.

The farmers in every state are plundered by the increasing prices exacted for tools and machinery and by extortionate rent, freight rates and storage charges.

Capitalist concentration is mercilessly crushing the class of small business men and driving its members into the ranks of propertyless wage-workers. The overwhelming majority of the people of America are being forced under a yoke of bondage by this soulless industrial despotism.

It is this capitalist system that is responsible for the increasing burden of armaments, the poverty, slums, child labor, most of the insanity, crime and prostitution, and much of the disease that afflicts mankind.

Under this system the working class is exposed to poisonous conditions, to frightful and needless perils to life and limb, is walled around with court decisions, injunctions and unjust laws, and is preyed upon incessantly for the benefit of the controlling oligarchy of wealth. Under it also, the children of the working class are doomed to ignorance, drudging toil and darkened lives.

In the face of these evils, so manifest that all thoughtful observers are appalled at them, the legislative representatives of the Republican and Democratic parties remain the faithful servants of the oppres-

sors. Measures designed to secure to the wage earners of this nation as humane and just treatment as is already enjoyed by the wage earners of all other civilized nations have been smothered in committee without debate, and laws ostensibly designed to bring relief to the farmers and general consumers are juggled and transformed into instruments for the exaction of further tribute. The growing unrest under oppression has driven these two old parties to the enactment of a variety of regulative measures, none of which has limited in any appreciable degree the power of the plutocracy, and some of which have been perverted into means for increasing that power. Anti-trust laws, railroad restrictions and regulations, with the prosecutions, indictments and investigations based upon such legislation, have proved to be utterly futile and ridiculous.

Nor has this plutocracy been seriously restrained or even threatened by any Republican or Democratic executive. It has continued to grow in power and insolence alike under the administrations of Cleveland, McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft.

In addition to this legislative juggling and this executive connivance, the courts of America have sanctioned and strengthened the hold of this plutocracy as the Dred Scott and other decisions strengthened the slave-power before the civil war. They have been used as instruments for the oppression of the working class and for the suppression of free speech and free assembly.

We declare, therefore, that the longer sufferance of these conditions is impossible, and we purpose to end them all. We declare them to be the product of the present system in which industry is carried on for private greed, instead of for the welfare of society. We declare, furthermore, that for these evils there will be and can be no remedy and no substantial relief except through Socialism, under which industry will be carried on for the common good and every worker receive the full social value of the wealth he creates.

Society is divided into warring groups and classes, based upon material interests. Fundamentally, this struggle is a conflict between the two main classes, one of which, the capitalist class, owns the means of production, and the other, the working class, must use these means of production on terms dictated by the owners.

The capitalist class, though few in numbers, absolutely controls the government—legislative, executive and judicial. This class owns the machinery of gathering and disseminating news through its organized press. It subsidizes seats of learning—the colleges and schools—and even religious and moral agencies. It has also the added prestige which established customs give to any order of society, right or wrong.

The working class, which includes all those who are forced to work for a living, whether by hand or brain, in shop, mine or on the soil, vastly outnumbers the capitalist class. Lacking effective organization and class solidarity, this class is unable to enforce its will. Given such class solidarity and effective organization, the workers will have the power to make all laws and control all industry in their own interest.

All political parties are the expression of economic class interests. All other parties than the Socialist party represent one or another group of the ruling capitalist class. Their political conflicts reflect merely superficial rivalries between competing capitalist groups. However they result, these conflicts have no issue of real value to the workers. Whether the Democrats or Republicans win politically, it is the capitalist class that is victorious economically.

The Socialist party is the political expression of the economic interests of the workers. Its defeats have been their defeats and its victories their victories. It is a party founded on the science and laws of social development. It proposes that, since all social necessities today are socially produced, the means of their production and distribution shall be socially owned and democratically controlled.

In the face of the economic and political aggressions of the capitalist class the only reliance left the workers is that of their economic organizations and their political power. By the intelligent and class-conscious use of these, they may resist successfully the capitalist class, break the fetters of wage-slavery, and fit themselves for the future society, which is to displace the capitalist system. The Socialist party appreciates the full significance of class organization and urges the wage earners, the working farmers and all other useful workers everywhere to organize for economic and political action, and we pledge ourselves to support the toilers of the fields as well as those in the shops, factories and mines of the nation in their struggles for economic justice.

In the defeat or victory of the working class party in this new struggle for freedom lies the defeat or triumph of the common people of all economic groups, as well as the failure or the triumph of popular government. Thus the Socialist party is the party of the present day revolution, which marks the transition from economic individualism to socialism, from wage slavery to free co-operation from capitalist oligarchy to industrial democracy.

WORKING PROGRAM.

As measures calculated to strengthen the working class in its fight for the realization of its ultimate aim, the co-operative commonwealth, and to increase its power of resistance capitalist oppression, we advocate and pledge ourselves and our elected officers to the following program:

COLLECTIVE OWNERSHIP.

1. The collective ownership and democratic management of railroads, wire and wireless telegraphs and telephones, express services, steamboat lines and all other social means of transportation and communication and of all large-scale industries.

2. The immediate acquirement by the municipalities, the states or the federal government of all grain elevators, stock yards, storage warehouses, and other distributing agencies, in order to reduce the present extortionate cost of living.

3. The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and water power.

4. The further conservation and development of natural resources for the use and benefit of all the people:

(a) By scientific forestation and timber protection.

(b) By the reclamation of arid and swamp tracts.

(c) By the storage of flood waters and the utilization of water power.

(d) By the stoppage of the present extravagant waste of the soil and of the products of mines and oil wells.

(e) By the development of highway and waterway systems.

5. The collective ownership of land wherever practicable, and in cases where such ownership is impracticable, the appropriation by taxation of the annual rental value of all land held for speculation or exploitation.

6. The collective ownership and democratic management of the banking and currency system.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

The immediate government relief of the unemployed by the extension of all useful public works. All persons employed on such works to be engaged directly by the government under a workday of not more than eight hours and at not less, than the prevailing union wages. The government also to establish employment bureaus; to lend money to states and municipalities without interest for the purpose of carrying on public works, and to take such other measures within its power as will lessen the widespread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist class.

INDUSTRIAL DEMANDS.

The conservation of human resources, particularly of the lives and well-being of the workers and their families:

1. By shortening the workday in keeping with the increased productivity of machinery.

2. By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week.

3. By securing a more effective inspection of workshops, factories and mines.

4. By forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of years.

5. By the co-operative organization of the industries in the federal penitentiaries for the benefit of the convicts and their dependents.

6. By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child labor, of convict labor and of all uninspected factories and mines.

7. By abolishing the profit system in government work and substituting either the direct hire of labor or the awarding of contracts to co-operative groups of workers.

8. By establishing minimum wage scales.

9. By abolishing official charity and substituting a non-contributory system of old-age pensions; a general system of insurance by the State of all its members against unemployment and invalidity and a system of compulsory insurance by employers of their workers without cost to the latter, against industrial diseases, accidents and death.

POLITICAL DEMANDS.

1. The absolute freedom of press, speech and assembly.

2. The adoption of a graduated income tax, the increase of the rate of the highest rate of corporation tax and the abolition of

inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the value of the estate and to nearness of kin—the proceeds of these taxes to be employed in the socialization of industry.

3. The abolition of the monopoly ownership of patents and the substitution of collective ownership, with direct rewards to inventors by premiums or royalties.

4. Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women.

5. The adoption of the initiative, referendum and recall and of proportional representation, nationally as well as locally.

6. The abolition of the Senate and of the veto power of the President.

7. The election of the President and the Vice-President by direct vote of the people.

8. The abolition of the power usurped by the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of the legislation enacted by Congress. National laws to be repealed only by act of Congress or by a referendum vote of the whole people.

9. The abolition of the present restrictions upon the amendment of the constitution, so that instrument may be made amendable by a majority of the voters in a majority of the States.

10. The granting of the right of suffrage in the District of Columbia with representation in Congress and a democratic form of municipal government for purely local affairs.

11. The extension of democratic government to all United States territory.

12. The enactment of further measures for general education and particularly for vocational education in useful pursuits.

The Bureau of Education to be made a Department.

13. The enactment of further measures for the conservation of health. The creation of an independent bureau of health, with such restrictions as will secure full liberty to all schools of practice.

14. The separation of the present Bureau of Labor from the Department of Commerce and Labor and its elevation to the rank of a department.

15. Abolition of all federal district courts and the United States circuit courts of appeals. State courts to have jurisdiction in all cases arising between citizens of the several states and foreign corporations. The election of all judges for short terms.

16. The immediate curbing of the power of the courts to issue injunctions.

17. The free administration of the law.

18. The calling of a convention for the revision of the constitution of the United States.

Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of socialized industry and thus come to their rightful inheritance.

CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL,

VICTOR L. BERGER,

JAMES F. CAREY,

J. STITT WILSON,

W. J. GHENT,

LEWIS J. DUNCAN,

CHARLES DOBBS,

DAN HOGAN,

A. W. RICKER, Committee.

APPENDIX H

National Constitution as Revised and Adopted by the Convention.

Amended by the National Convention of the party, May, 1912, and approved by referendum Aug. 4, 1912.

Issued by the National Office of the Socialist Party, 111 North Market street, Chicago.

ARTICLE I.

Name.

Sec. 1. The name of this organization shall be the Socialist Party, except in such states where a different name has or may become a legal requirement.

ARTICLE II.

Membership.

Sec. 1. Every person, resident of the United States of the age of eighteen years and upward, without discrimination as to sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties and political organizations, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist Party, including political action and unrestricted political rights for both sexes, shall be eligible to membership in the party.

Sec. 2. No person holding an elective public office by gift of any party or organization other than the Socialist Party shall be eligible to membership in the Socialist Party; nor shall any member of the party accept or hold any appointive public office, honorary or remunerative (Civil Service positions excepted), without the consent of his state organization. No party member shall be a candidate for public office without the consent of the City, County or State organizations, according to the nature of the office.

Sec. 3. A member who desires to transfer his membership from the party in one state to the party in another state may do so upon the presentation of his card showing him to be in good standing at the time of asking for such transfer and also a transfer card duly signed by the secretary of the local from which he transfers.

Sec. 4. No member of the party, in any state or territory, shall, under any pretext, interfere with the regular or organized movement in any other state.

Sec. 5. All persons joining the Socialist Party shall sign the following pledge: "I, the undersigned, recognizing the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working class and the necessity of the working class constituting itself into a political party distinct from and opposed to all parties formed by the capitalist class, hereby declare that I have severed my relations with all other parties, and I indorse the platform and constitution of the Socialist Party including the principle of political action, and hereby apply for admission to said party."

Sec. 6. Any member of the party who opposes political action or advocates

crime, sabotage, or other methods of violence as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation shall be expelled from membership in the party. Political action shall be construed to mean participation in elections for public office and practical legislative and administrative work along the lines of the Socialist Party platform.

ARTICLE III.

Management.

Sec. 1. The affairs of the Socialist Party shall be administered by the National Committee, its sub-committees and officials, the National Convention and the general vote of the party.

ARTICLE IV.

National Committee.

Sec. 1. The National Committee shall consist of the State Secretaries of all organized states and territories, or such other person as the members of the party in the state shall elect by referendum vote, and of one additional member from each state or territory for every 3,000 members in good standing in such state or territory. For the purpose of determining the representation to which each state or territory may be entitled, the Executive Secretary shall compute at the beginning of each calendar year the average dues-paying membership of such state or territory for the preceding year.

Sec. 2. Three years' consecutive membership in the party shall be necessary to qualify for membership in the National Committee, its standing sub-committees, and executive officials.

Sec. 3. The National Committee shall meet in regular session on the first Sunday after the first Monday in May of each year, except in years when National Conventions of the party are to be held, in which years it shall hold its sessions in conjunction with the convention.

Sec. 4. Special meetings of the National Committee shall be held when determined by vote of two-thirds of its members.

Sec. 5. The members of the National Committee attending the meetings shall be paid from the national treasury their railroad fares and \$2.50 per day to cover expenses.

ARTICLE V.

The Duties and Powers of the National Committee.

Sec. 1. The duties of this committee shall be:

(a) To represent the party in all National and International affairs.

(b) To call National Conventions and special conventions decided upon by the referendum of the party.

(c) To make reports of the membership and reports and recommendations to the National Conventions.

(d) To perfect and strengthen the organization and the work of propaganda in such states and territories as may require the assistance of the National Organization.

(e) To maintain in connection with the National Office a Lecture Bureau for the purpose of arranging lectures or lecture courses for the propaganda of Socialism; a Literature Bureau for the publication and dissemination of Socialist literature, a press service that will furnish patent and plate matter for Socialist papers, and such other bureaus or departments as it may from time to time decide to establish.

(f) To establish a uniform rate of compensation for all lecturers and organizers working under the auspices of the National Organization.

(g) To formulate the rules and order of business of the National Conventions of the party and otherwise provided for by this constitution, subject to adoption and amendment by the convention.

(h) To receive dues and reports from state organizations.

(i) To conduct national referendums in the manner provided by this constitution, to consider and report upon the program, propaganda and organization of the party.

(j) To recommend to the membership of the party amendments to the constitution.

(k) To supervise the work and to transact all current business of the National Office.

Sec. 2. The National Committee shall elect an Executive Committee of five members and a Woman's National Committee of seven members; no two members of either of these committees shall be from the same state.

Sec. 3. It shall also elect an Executive Secretary, and a General Correspondent for the Woman's National Committee.

Sec. 4. The members of the Executive Committee and of the Woman's National Committee need not be members of the National Committee and the Executive Secretary and General Correspondent of the Woman's National Committee shall not be members of the committee.

Sec. 5. Members of the Executive Committee, Woman's National Committee, the Executive Secretary and the General Correspondent of the said committee may at any time and on proper motion be recalled or temporarily suspended from office by the National Committee.

Sec. 6. No member of the National Committee or of the Executive Committee shall be eligible to any position of permanent employment in the National Office, but such members may be appointed lecturers of courses arranged by the National Office and may be given temporary assignments for special party work.

Sec. 7. The National Committee shall elect from its own membership a permanent chairman, who shall serve without salary. The committee shall formulate its own rules of procedure, not inconsistent with the provisions of this constitution.

Sec. 8. All standing committees and permanent officers of the National Committee shall be elected at the regular meetings of the committee and shall serve for the term of one year from the first day of June following the date of their election.

Sec. 9. The election of the Executive Committee, the Woman's National Committee, the Executive Secretary, General Correspondent of the Woman's National Committee and the submission of proposed amendments to this constitution, and all

other affirmative actions of the committee shall be taken at its regular or special meetings. Between such meetings the National Committee shall initiate no motions or resolutions except as hereinafter provided, and except motions to recall members of the sub-committees, or officials elected by it, or to fill vacancies in such committees and offices. All business of the National Committee shall, in the intervals between its sessions, be transacted by correspondence.

Sec. 10. Members of the Executive Committee, the Woman's National Committee, the Executive Secretary, General Correspondent of the Woman's National Committee and all other National Officials, may be recalled at any time by the membership of the party in the same manner which has been provided for the initiation and conduct of national referendums.

Sec. 11. No motion shall be submitted to a referendum of the National Committee by correspondence unless supported within fifteen days by not less than five members of the National Committee from three different states.

Sec. 12. Neither the National Committee nor the Executive Committee shall appropriate funds of the National Organization for any purpose not directly connected with the propaganda of Socialism or the struggles of labor; no more than one hundred dollars shall be appropriated to any organization other than a subdivision of the party; no application for financial assistance coming from locals or other subdivisions of state organizations shall be entertained unless they have the indorsement of the state organization.

ARTICLE VI.

Executive Committee.

Sec. 1. The Executive Committee shall, between sessions of the National Committee, be vested with all the powers and shall perform all the duties of the National Committee except that it shall have no power to call National Conventions, formulate rules for the conventions, recommend amendments to the constitution, or fill vacancies in its own body or the Woman's National Committee or in the office of the Executive Secretary or the General Correspondent of the Woman's National Committee or to recall such members or officer.

Sec. 2. The Executive Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure not inconsistent with this constitution, or with the rules of the National Committee. A stenographic report of all discussions taking place in the committee shall be kept for the information of the National Committee.

Sec. 3. The Executive Committee shall transmit copies of the minutes of its meetings to all members of the National Committee; such minutes shall also be published in the Monthly Bulletin. All acts and resolutions of the Executive Committee shall become binding and effective upon their passage, but any member of the National Committee may within fifteen days after notice of such act or resolution has been mailed by the National Office to the members of the National Committee, move to reverse or modify such act or resolution, and such motion shall be disposed of in the same manner as other National Committee motions.

Sec. 4. All meetings of the National Committee and of the Executive Committee shall be held in the city in which the headquarters of the party shall be located.

Sec. 5. The Executive Committee shall print a specific statement in the Bulletin of all moneys expended for printing leaflets and books, and the names of the same and their authors.

ARTICLE VII.

Executive Secretary.

Sec. 1. The Executive Secretary shall receive as compensation the sum of \$1,500.00 annually and shall give a bond in a sum fixed by the National Committee.

Sec. 2. The Executive Secretary shall have charge of all affairs of the National Office, including the employment of necessary help, subject to the directions of the Executive Committee and the National Committee. He shall receive the reports of the state organizations and of the local organizations in unorganized states and territories. He shall supervise the accounts of the National Office and the Lecture Bureau, the Literature Bureau and such other departments as may hereafter be established in connection with the National Office.

Sec. 3. The Executive Secretary shall issue to all party organizations Monthly Bulletins which shall contain all important official reports and announcements; a report of the financial affairs of the party; a summary of the conditions and membership of the several state and territorial organizations; the principal business transacted by the National officials and such other matters pertaining to the organization of the party as may be of general interest to the membership. No personal correspondence shall be published.

The Bulletin shall be largely given to accounts of the more important organization and propaganda work of the national, state, territorial and local organizations, and to the work, discussion and explanation of new and effective methods of organization, education and propaganda.

ARTICLE VIII.

Representatives in Congress.

Sec. 1. Members of Congress elected on the ticket of the Socialist Party shall submit reports of their actions in Congress to the National Conventions and to the annual meetings of the National Committee.

Sec. 2. They shall carry out instructions which may be given to them by National Conventions, by the National Committee in session, or by a general referendum of the party.

Sec. 3. The Socialist representatives in Congress shall organize themselves into a Socialist Congressional group, separate and apart from all other political parties represented in Congress. They shall elect a chairman of the group, shall confer with each other on all measures involving questions of Socialist principles, policy and tactics, and shall vote on such questions as a unit according to the decision of a majority of the members.

ARTICLE IX.

Conventions.

Sec. 1. The regular National Conventions of the party shall be held in all years in which elections for President and Vice-President of the United States are to be held.

Sec. 2. Special Conventions of the party may be held at any time if decided upon by a general vote of the party membership. Such general vote shall also fix the date and place of such special convention.

Sec. 3. The date and place of the regular conventions shall be fixed by the National Committee at its regular annual meeting held in the year preceding such convention.

Sec. 4. The National Convention shall be composed of three hundred delegates to be apportioned among the states in the following manner:

One from each State and Territory and the remainder in proportion to the average national dues paid by the organizations of such States and Territories during the preceding year. No delegate shall be eligible unless he is a resident member of the state from which his credential is presented, and shall have been a member of the party organization at least three years.

Sec. 5. Railroad fare, including tourist sleeper carfare, of delegates going to and coming from the conventions of the party and the per diem allowance of \$2.50 to cover expenses, shall be paid from the National Treasury, by setting aside a portion of the national dues sufficient to cover the same, to be estimated at the beginning of each year.

Sec. 6. The expenses of delegates attending conventions and of members of the National Committee and the Executive Committee attending the respective sessions of their committees shall be raised by setting aside such portion of the national dues as may be required to cover the same, to be computed by the National Committee annually in advance.

Sec. 7. The election of delegates to the National Convention shall, wherever possible, be completed not later than 60 days preceding the convention; and the respective state secretaries shall furnish the Executive Secretary with a list of accredited delegates immediately after said election.

The Executive Secretary shall prepare a printed roster of the accredited delegates to be sent to each delegate and forwarded to the party press for publication. Such list shall contain the occupation of each delegate at the time of his nomination and his office or employment to be party. All official reports required to be presented to the National Convention shall be printed and sent to each delegate elected at least fifteen days before the date of the convention and furnished to the party press for publication.

At the time and place set for the opening of the National Convention, the chairman of the National Committee shall call the convention to order, and shall call the roll to ascertain the number of uncontested delegates, and they shall permanently organize the convention.

Sec. 8. All national platforms, amendments of platforms, and resolutions adopted by any National Convention shall be submitted serially to a referendum vote of the membership. One-fourth of the regularly elected delegates shall be entitled to have alternative paragraphs to be submitted at the same time. Such alternative paragraphs, signed by one-fourth of such delegates, shall be filed with the Executive Secretary not later than one day after the adjournment of the convention.

ARTICLE X.

State Organizations.

Sec. 1. The formation of all state or territorial organizations or the reorganization of state or territorial organizations which may have lapsed shall be under the direction of the Executive Committee and

in conformity with the rules of the National Committee.

Sec. 2. No state or territory may be organized unless it has at least ten locals or an aggregate membership of not less than two hundred, but this provision shall not affect the rights of states and territories organized prior to the adoption of this constitution. When the membership of any state averages less than 150 per month for any six consecutive months the National Committee may revoke the charter of that state.

Sec. 3. The platform of the Socialist Party shall be the supreme declaration of the party, and all state and municipal platforms shall conform thereto. No state or local organization shall under any circumstances fuse, combine or compromise with any other political party or organization, or refrain from making nominations, in order to favor the candidate of such other organizations, nor shall any candidate of the Socialist Party accept any nomination or endorsement from any other party or political organization.

No member of the Socialist Party shall, under any circumstances, vote in primary or regular elections for any candidate other than Socialists nominated, endorsed or recommended as candidates by the Socialist Party. To do otherwise will constitute party treason, and result in expulsion from the party.

Sec. 4. In states and territories in which there is one central organization affiliated with the party, the state or territorial organizations shall have the sole jurisdiction of the members residing within their respective territories, and the sole control of all matters pertaining to the propaganda, organization and financial affairs with such state or territory; provided, such propaganda is in harmony with the national platform and declared policy of the party. Their activity shall be confined to their respective organizations, and the National Committee, its sub-committees or officers shall have no right to interfere in such matters without the consent of the respective state or territorial organizations.

Sec. 5. The State Committees shall make monthly reports to the Executive Secretary concerning their membership, financial condition and general standing of the party.

During the months of January and July of each year, or at any other time required by the Executive Committee or by this constitution, the state secretaries shall furnish the Executive Secretary a list of all locals affiliated with their respective state organizations, together with the number of members in good standing, and the name and address of the corresponding secretary of each local. Refusal, failure or neglect to comply with this section shall subject the state organization to suspension from the Socialist Party and deprive such state organization of participation in the affairs of the Socialist Party, and shall be a forfeiture of the right to representation in the National Committee, the Executive Committee, the conventions and congresses of the party.

Sec. 6. The State Committees shall pay to the National Committee every month a sum equal to five cents for each member in good standing within their respective states and territories. And only due stamps issued by the National Committee shall be affixed to members' dues cards as valid receipts for the payment of dues.

Sec. 7. The National Office shall also issue to the state secretaries "exempt stamps" free of charge, to be used by party members temporarily unable to pay

dues on account of unemployment caused by sickness, strikes, lockouts or any other condition not within their control. In cases where husband and wife are both party members and only one of them is in receipt of an income the other may likewise be allowed to use such "exempt stamps."

Any member desiring to use such "exempt stamps" shall make application therefor to the financial secretary of his local organization, and such application shall be passed upon by such organization. "Exempt stamps" shall be issued only to members in good standing who have paid dues for at least three months and who are by the same action exempt from the payment of dues to the state and local organizations. The number of "exempt stamps" shall not exceed 10 per cent of the total number of stamps obtained by the respective state organizations. The acceptance of "exempt stamps" by any member shall in no way disqualify such member from any rights and privileges of party membership.

Sec. 8. All state organizations shall provide in their constitutions for the initiative, referendum and imperative mandate.

Sec. 9. No person shall be nominated or endorsed by any subdivision of the party for candidate for public office unless he is a member of the party and has been such for at least two years. But this provision shall not apply to organizations which have been in existence for less than two years.

Sec. 10. No local or branch organization shall be formed on the basis of the occupation of its members.

ARTICLE XI. Headquarters.

Sec. 1. The location of the headquarters of the party shall be determined by the National Committee.

ARTICLE XII.

International Delegates and International Secretaries.

Delegates to the International Congress and International Secretary shall be elected by referendum in the year in which the Congress is held. The call for nominations shall be made on the first day of January. Forty days shall be allowed for nominations, fifteen for acceptances and declinations and sixty for the referendum. There shall be one delegate for every twenty thousand members, ascertained by computing the average for the preceding year. The requisite number of candidates receiving the highest number of votes shall be elected. The next highest in the election shall be the alternates. The expenses of the delegates and a per diem equal to the per diem fixed for national organizers and lecturers shall be paid out of the national treasury.

ARTICLE XIII.

Woman's National Committee.

Sec. 1. The Woman's National Committee shall have the general charge of propaganda and organization among women. All plans of said committee concurred in by the Executive Committee shall be carried out at the expense of the National Office.

Sec. 2. The General Correspondent of the Woman's National Committee shall be attached to the National Office.

Sec. 3. The Woman's National Committee shall meet in regular session once in each year, in conjunction with the session of the National Committee. Special meet-

ings of the Woman's Committee may be called at any time by the concurrent consent of the Executive Committee and the Woman's National Committee.

Sec. 4. Railroad fares and expenses of the members of the Woman's National Committee shall be paid by the National Office on the same basis as the fares and expenses of the members of the National Committee.

ARTICLE XIV.

Foreign Speaking Federations.

Sec. 1. Five branches of the Socialist Party working in any other language than English shall have the right to form a National Federation under the supervision of the Executive Secretary and the Executive Committee.

Sec. 2. Such National Language Federation shall have the right to elect an officer known as Translator-Secretary, who shall be conversant with his own language as well as the English language, and whose duty it shall be to serve as a medium of communication between his federation and the National Organization of the Socialist Party.

Sec. 3. When such National Language Federation shall have at least 500 members their Translator-Secretary shall be entitled to necessary office room in the National Office, and to a salary from the national body not to exceed \$28 per week, nor to be less than \$15, the exact sum to be fixed by the Executive Committee of the Socialist Party. Such Translator-Secretary must be at least three consecutive years a member of the party except when his federation has not been affiliated with the party that length of time.

Sec. 4. Language federations shall pay to the National Office the same sum monthly per capita as paid by the State Organizations, receiving in exchange therefor due stamps. They shall also pay through the Translator-Secretary to the regular state and county or city organization 50 per cent of the dues paid by the English speaking branches. The Translator-Secretary shall pay to the respective State Secretaries the tax on all members of his nationality in the states. The State Secretary shall forward the county dues to the respective county secretaries, wherever there is an organized county.

Sec. 5. Branches of language federations shall be an integral part of the county and state organizations, and must in all cases, work in harmony with the constitution and platform of the state and county organizations of the Socialist Party.

Sec. 6. All propaganda work of the language federations shall be carried out under the supervision of their executive officers according to the by-laws of the federations. Such by-laws must be in conformity with the constitution of the Socialist Party.

Sec. 7. Each Translator-Secretary shall submit a monthly report of the dues stamps sold during that period to the National and State offices. He shall make every three months also a report of the general standing of his federation to the National Office.

Sec. 8. The National Party shall not recognize more than one federation of the same language.

Sec. 9. Each national federation shall be entitled to elect one fraternal delegate to the National Conventions of the

party; provided, that such delegate shall have a voice but no vote.

ARTICLE XV.

Referendum.

Sec. 1. Motions to amend any part of this constitution, as well as any other motions or resolutions to be voted upon by the entire membership of the party, shall be submitted by the Executive Secretary to the referendum vote of the party membership, upon the request of at least three states representing at least 5 per cent of the entire membership of the party, on the basis of dues paid in the preceding year, or of five states regardless of membership. The term "state," as herein used, shall be construed to mean the membership of a state organization, the State Committee or a duly authorized State Executive Committee.

Sec. 2. Such a referendum may be initiated by one State, and when so initiated shall remain open for ninety days from the date of its first publication, and unless it shall receive the requisite number of seconds within such period it shall be abandoned. The vote on every such referendum shall close sixty days from the date of its submission.

Sec. 3. Referendums to revoke or amend the provisions of this constitution may be instituted only one year after the adoption of such provisions.

ARTICLE XVI.

Amendments.

Sec. 1. This constitution may be amended by a National Convention, National Committee in session, or by a referendum of the party in the manner above provided. But all amendments made by a National Convention or National Committee in session shall be submitted serially to a referendum vote of the party membership.

Sec. 2. All amendments shall take effect sixty days after being approved by the membership.

ARTICLE XVII.

Tenure.

Sec. 1. The members of the Executive Committee, the Woman's National Committee, the National Secretary and the General Correspondent of the Woman's National Committee, now in office, shall remain in office until June 1, 1913, when the members of the Executive Committee, the Woman's National Committee, the Executive Secretary and the General Correspondent of the Woman's National Committee, elected by the National Committee as herein provided, shall take their respective places.

Sec. 2. As soon as this constitution shall take effect, the provisions of the same affecting the Executive Committee, the Woman's National Committee, the Executive Secretary, and the General Correspondent of the Woman's National Committee shall be binding upon the corresponding officers under the present constitution in so far as they are capable of application to them, and when not so applicable, the provisions of the present constitution shall govern.

Between the time when this constitution takes effect and the first day of April, 1913, all state organizations shall elect members of the National Committee in accordance with the provisions of the constitution.

APPENDIX I

Report of the Woman's Department.

To the Socialist Party National Convention, 1912:

There is nothing more hopeful in the outlook for the Socialist Party than the rapid growth in the number of woman members and the increasing scope of their work in all matters pertaining to its welfare.

Ten years ago the woman's movement in our party was a negligible quantity, existing chiefly in the minds of a few devoted women.

At the birth of the present Socialist Party, which took place at the Unity Convention of 1901, there were eight women who attended as regularly elected delegates.

Their influence was that of individual women and not that of representatives of any special movement of unrest or protest among the women of the working class. Such a movement had not yet had time for formation and we find no mention made in the minutes of the convention of woman's activity in the party organization, or of any need for special propaganda among women. The only mention made of the party's attitude toward women is in the platform which demands "equal civil and political rights for men and women."

Three years later, in the national convention of 1904, the number of women delegates had not increased. California, Oregon, Colorado, Iowa, Wisconsin and Pennsylvania each sent one, while Kansas sent two women in a delegation of six.

In the proceedings of this convention, also, we search in vain for any acknowledgment of the special wrongs or needs of the working women, or of the necessity for any particular line of work to reach them with the Socialist message and enlist them in the party organization.

The constitution remained silent upon the organization of women, and the platform simply demanded equal suffrage for men and women.

The Socialist women definitely made their debut in the party organization at the National Convention of 1908. Twenty of them appeared upon the floor of the convention as delegates from fourteen states. Each of the twenty had a decided opinion as to the best way to reach her sisters and bring them into the fold.

From the first day to the last no group in the convention was more active and aggressive than were the women.

During the years from 1904 to 1908 the Socialist party had awakened to the fact that the "woman question" was a vital, living issue and must receive consideration. So, on the afternoon of the first day, the committee on rules recommended that "a committee on women and their relationship to the Socialist Party shall be elected, to consist of nine members," and the committee was duly elected.

The report of this committee recommended that a permanent Woman's National Committee, consisting of five members, be elected to formulate plans for, and to have charge of, the special work of propaganda and organization among women. It also provided that a special woman organizer be kept permanently in the field.

Not only did the convention adopt the above plans for pushing the work among women, but it also enlarged upon the meager platform demand of 1904 by inserting the plank, "Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women, and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction."

The quiet, earnest work of the women pioneers had at least borne fruit and woman's share in the affairs of the party was now officially recognized. It but remained for her to outline her plan of action and put it into effect.

The Woman's National Committee proceeded to do this in a most efficient manner. A "Plan of Work for Women in Socialist Locals" was prepared and widely circulated.

Special leaflets dealing with many phases of the woman question and the industrial conditions particularly affecting women and children, were published.

By 1910 the special woman's work was so well established that the National Party Congress of that year embodied in the National Constitution provisions for its continuance. An amendment which was included in the report of the Committee on Constitution and adopted by the Congress, provided that a Woman's National Committee, consisting of seven women, be elected in a manner similar to the election of the National Executive Committee and that it have charge of the propaganda and organization among women. It further provided that all plans of the committee concurred in by the National Executive Committee be carried out at the expense of the National Office.

The closing paragraph of the report of the Woman's National Committee contained the recommendation that there be installed a Woman's Department in the National Office and that the manager of this department be one of the regular employees of the office. The report was adopted.

Now, indeed, the women had become a bona fide institution in the party organization. The Woman's National Committee elected a general correspondent to take charge of the Woman's Department and the work among women was established upon a permanent basis.

GENERAL RESULTS OF 1910-'11.

Much has been accomplished within the past two years. Many local woman's committees have been organized, hundreds of thousands of leaflets for women have been

distributed. Women are serving as secretaries of five states, and of two hundred and seventy locals.

One member of the National Executive Committee, two members of the National Committee and one of the International Secretaries are women. Fifteen states have women State Correspondents. Among our best known national lecturers and organizers, eight are women, and over twenty women have come under our notice as doing exceptionally good work on the Socialist platform in a national way.

It is difficult to form an estimate of the results of the special agitation among women that the Socialist Party has been carrying on during the last two years.

We have been unable to get complete information regarding the number of women members of the party or the number of woman's committees, although several times letters have been sent to the local and state secretaries, asking them for this information. A very small per cent of the secretaries complied with the request. It is roughly estimated, however, that the women constitute one-tenth of the entire membership.

About two hundred and fifty circular letters were sent out to locals having active women members, requesting answers to certain questions. Thirty-five replies were received. A summary of the work done by the women in these thirty-five locals shows remarkable activity. But no summary in dollars and cents can measure the actual result of their work. It represents many thousands of women and young girls to take part intelligently in the class struggle and work side by side with their brothers in winning the emancipation of the working class.

The summary of the reports from these thirty-five committees shows that these locals have a combined membership of 1,677 women.

During the year 1911 these committees have held 850 meetings. This does not account for all the woman's meetings held, even in these thirty-five places. In the New York and Chicago reports, only the largest and most important meetings were recorded. Meetings held by the woman members in the individual branches were not reported for either of these cities.

During the year 1911 and the latter part of 1910, these committees through their own efforts, raised nearly \$10,000, or, to be exact, \$9,740.09. This is exclusive of the money they helped to raise in the regular work of the locals; \$5,893.96 were raised for strike benefits, \$866.50 for campaign funds, \$529.49 for the support of the Socialist press, \$337.35 for assisting in the furnishing of local headquarters, and \$214.93 were spent for special literature for women.

When we realize that \$10,000 were raised by the women in only thirty-five out of the five thousand Socialist locals and branches in the United States, we can begin to appreciate that from a financial standpoint, if from no other, it is important to enlist the women in the active work as members of the party.

In ten of these cities—those large enough to require the assistance of the women—they were at the polls serving as watchers and clerks. They also served as registration clerks and, in Los Angeles, went from house to house instructing the women how to vote.

During the Shirtwaist Strike in New York and the Garment Workers' Strike in Chicago, Socialist women addressed their

meetings, did picket service, gave benefits and assisted in every way possible.

The women not only fold and stamp the literature, but they go out with the men comrades and distribute it from door to door. They form themselves in squads and sell it at meetings, or distribute it free at the doors of factories and stores. Over 500,000 leaflets, besides thousands of copies of the Progressive Woman, have been distributed in this way.

SOCIALIST SCHOOLS.

When women enter into any movement they take the children with them. Four of our large cities report excellent work being done among the children.

New York has several Socialist schools. Lessons are prepared by May Wood-Simons, Edith C. Breithut and others. The New York schools are experimenting with these lessons and if they are a success they will be published and put into general use throughout the country for next year's work. The demand for material for Socialist schools is constantly on the increase. By another year a systematic course of lessons should be ready for use.

Rochester, N. Y., has a school with an average attendance of two hundred pupils. Los Angeles, California, reports a splendid school which they call a Socialist Lyceum.

New Jersey has elected a special school committee, which has prepared a leaflet giving excellent instructions regarding the organization of Socialist schools. This committee is entering upon its work in a thorough manner and good results may be expected.

The New York State Committee on Socialist Schools prepared an outline on "How to Organize Socialist Schools." This has been published by the Woman's National Committee and recommended to be used in locals desiring to reach the children.

ANTI-BOY SCOUT ORGANIZATION.

Bridgeport, Connecticut, has an Anti-Boy Scout organization, with a membership of thirty-nine boys. St. Louis has an organization of boys which they have named the Universal Scouts of Freedom. They are organized by wards, as a part of the work of the ward branches. Through their efforts one corps of Boy Scouts was induced to disband. They also made their influence felt by supporting Union Labor in the stand it took against permitting the Boy Scouts to take part in the parade on the occasion of President Taft's visit to St. Louis.

WOMAN'S DAY.

Woman's Day, February 25th, was observed to a far greater extent than ever before.

Every available speaker was secured by the active locals and the meetings were well advertised.

The White Slave Traffic was the subject chosen for discussion and a special program upon this subject was prepared by the Woman's National Committee.

This program, consisting of songs, recitations and readings, fitted for a full evening's entertainment, was advertised in the weekly and monthly bulletins sent out from our National Office.

Over 150 orders were filled and many more were received, but the supply was exhausted.

Glowing reports of the success of the entertainments were sent in by the comrades from many places with the request that similar programs be furnished regularly.

The capitalist papers gave a surprising amount of space to the observance of this day, designating it as the Socialist Woman's

Day. In a few instances more than two columns were given to an account of the celebration.

EQUAL SUFFRAGE PETITION.

In August, 1911, the Woman's National Committee recommended the circulation of a petition for woman suffrage, to be presented by Congressman Victor L. Berger, Socialist Representative from Wisconsin. The recommendation was concurred in by the National Executive Committee and the following petition was prepared:

"We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, over twenty-one years of age, hereby request you to submit to the legislatures of the several states for ratification an amendment to the National Constitution which shall enable women to vote in all elections upon the same terms as men."

One hundred thousand copies of this petition have been sent to all of the Socialist locals, thousands of labor organizations, and to every source from which it was believed signatures could be obtained.

Requests for them are still being received. We have sent out the call for all signed petitions to be returned to the National Office and will complete the counting and forward them to Congressman Berger within the next month.

The circulation of this petition has been of great educational value and has afforded one of the best means by which the position of the Socialist Party upon the question of equal suffrage for men and women has been verified.

On January 16, 1912, Congressman Berger introduced in the House of Representatives the following Joint Resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.

"SECTION 2. When the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied or in any way abridged on the ground of sex, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such citizens shall bear to the whole number of male and female citizens twenty-one years of age in such state."

WOMAN ORGANIZERS.

At the opening of the Woman's Department in the National Office, Anna A. Maley was the only National woman organizer sent out by the Woman's National Committee. Comrade Maley is one of the most capable organizers in the Socialist Party. Her work proved of great service to the committee. Later she gave up the work to become the editor of "The Commonwealth."

Florence Wattles and Nellie M. Zeh were elected as organizers for the committee.

Comrade Wattles was assigned to Indiana. As a result of seven weeks' work in this state, two local committees were organized and the woman's movement was given great impetus throughout the state. Much of her work was in unorganized places. She organized many locals, though the movement was too new to form committees of women.

In December, 1911, Comrade Wattles began work in Pennsylvania. During the four months in that state she has organized forty committees and has strengthened not only the work among women, but the general movement as well. The state secretary of Indiana has requested that she be returned to that state for the remainder of the campaign and this has been so arranged.

Comrade Zeh was unable to enter upon the work at that time, but she is now preparing to take it up along special lines in the south.

Mary L. Geffs was authorized to do some special work in Colorado, with encouraging results.

Janet Fenimore, Prudence Stokes Brown and Madge Patton Stephens have been elected by the committee to serve as woman organizers during the coming campaign.

Among the organizers who have carried on the general propaganda work, special credit is due to Milla Tupper Maynard, Theresa Serber Malkiel, Ella Reeve Bloor and John M. Work for their earnest efforts to strengthen the movement among the women. In addition to their regular duties, when in the field work, they made a special plea to women to join the party and urged the comrades to elect the woman members of the respective locals into committees to carry on the propaganda among women.

They sent in to the General Correspondent the names of the active women along the route, thereby enabling the General Correspondent to communicate directly with these women and explain the work to be done in their locality.

If all our organizers would adopt this plan the beneficial results upon the organization would soon be felt.

LITERATURE FOR WOMEN.

The Woman's National Committee, through the National Office, has published leaflets upon the following subjects: Boys in the Mines, Boytown Railroad, Boy Scout Movement, Crimes of Capitalism, Work Among Women, Children in Textile Industries, Class War, Elizabeth Cady Stanton on Socialism, Frances E. Willard on Socialism, Socialism vs. Alcoholism, Literature for Women, Plea to the Club Women, Poverty the Cause of Intemperance, The Teacher and Socialism, To the Working Woman, To Wives of Tailors, Underfed School Children, Why the Professional Woman Should Be a Socialist, Wimmen Ain't Got No Kick, Woman, Comrade and Equal, The Worker and the Machine, Why You Should Be a Socialist, and Woman's Work in Socialist Locals.

Other than these leaflets, the special Socialist literature for women handled by the National Office is exceedingly limited. It consists of the following: Socialism and the Home, Woman and the Social Problem, Women and Socialism, A Woman's Place, and Bebel's "Woman and Socialism."

LITERATURE FOR CHILDREN.

There is a growing demand for Socialist literature for children. The supply of this is even more meager than that for women. At present we have nothing on hand that is

really applicable to the needs of the average child.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES.

At the request of the Woman's National Committee, many of our well known comrades contributed short articles upon questions of importance to women. Twenty-three articles were sent out during the year 1911, each going to about 125 papers. If each paper had printed each article, an equivalent of 2,875 articles would have been put in circulation through the work of the Woman's National Committee.

The newspaper propaganda is developing into one of the most important departments of our work. No other woman's organization in the United States—I may say of the world—has such an opportunity to carry its propaganda into working-class homes.

We have at our disposal about four hundred Socialist and other Labor papers that will print upon the average two articles pertaining to women each month. This means an equivalent of 800 articles each month, or 9,600 a year. And the list steadily increases in number.

NATIONAL TEACHERS' BUREAU.

The Socialist Teachers' Bureau is gradually growing in importance as a useful department in the work of the National Office.

It was started in August, 1911, by Comrade Terence Vincent, who conducted it in an able manner. Later it was placed in the hands of the Woman's Department.

The purpose of the Bureau is to enable Socialist teachers to get in touch with Socialist members of School Boards. Also by having a complete list of Socialist teachers on file in the National Office, something in the nature of a loose organization exists which is easy to circularize and to keep in touch with all matters pertaining to their special line of work.

It is useless to apply for assistance in regard to securing either a position or a teacher unless the applicant encloses proof of his paid-up membership in the party. Compliance with this request is a necessary safeguard.

When this proof has been furnished the application is placed on file. All information is considered strictly confidential—only those applicants who have proved their party membership being entitled to it.

A Socialist teacher applying for a position receives a list of the positions open, together with the available information regarding salary and grade. A Socialist school director applying for a teacher receives a list of teachers, stating the positions they are prepared to fill. Then correspondence may be opened between the director and the teacher, and the work of the National Office along this line has been fulfilled.

At the present time we have on hand applications for positions from forty-nine teachers and inquiries regarding the securing of Socialist teachers to fill twenty vacancies.

The National Office does not guarantee positions, nor does it guarantee good faith upon the part of either applicant. It simply helps to bring the teacher and the position together, rendering service free of charge.

It does this because of the ever growing demand of school directors for Socialist teachers, and of Socialist teachers for positions in which they can teach unhindered by the prejudice of capitalist-minded school boards.

FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

Thus far the Woman's Department has been obliged to concentrate its energies upon the work of reaching the women of the general membership and has found it impossible to conduct special propaganda work among our foreign speaking comrades. The time is now at hand, however, when a start along these lines can be made and preparations are on foot toward this end.

The foreign translator-secretaries have selected the women's leaflets best suited to their purposes and the National Office will publish them in their respective languages.

In the large cities where the Central Woman's Committees are elected to conduct the work of agitation and organization throughout all branches, special effort will be made from this time forth to co-operate with the women in foreign speaking organizations and induce them to send representatives to the Central Woman's Committee.

The Finnish women are doing most excellent work. They have their own weekly paper called "Toveritar," meaning "The Comrades." It consists of eight pages and is well gotten up in every way. Comrade Heini-Vitikainen is the editor.

In our Finnish locals the women constitute one-third of the membership and are active in all branches of the work. This no doubt accounts for the fact that the Finnish have one of the most perfect and efficient organizations in the United States. The women are working in the Socialist Party side by side with the men, both of them concentrating their energies upon its work.

The German women comrades of New York City are doing active work. They have organized in separate woman's branches with a total of about 280 members. They also sent a German woman organizer into the field and she formed organizations in Chicago, Syracuse, Rochester and Philadelphia.

The German women raised contributions for the campaign fund and for the Volks-Zeitung, the New York Call and other Socialist papers. They also prepared and distributed Socialist leaflets printed in the German language.

No reports have been received from other nationalities.

WOMEN'S PERIODICALS.

The Progressive Woman is the only Socialist publication for English-speaking women in the United States. It has a circulation of about 12,000.

This paper has made a valiant fight for its life, and has received all possible support from the Woman's National Committee. It has been a great help to the committee and has been one of the means through which so much work has been accomplished.

During 1911 programs for use in Socialist locals were prepared by the Committee and published monthly in the Progressive Woman. In other ways it enabled the Woman's National Committee to carry on its work, and it is today the only woman's paper for carrying the Socialist message into English-speaking homes.

During the Mexican revolution, when every effort was being made to fan the military spirit into white heat in the United States, this paper was turned over to the Woman's National Committee and a special anti-military edition was prepared. Over 30,000 copies were placed in circulation. (Address, The Progressive Woman, 111 North Market Street, Chicago, Ill.)

"Toveritar," or "The Woman Comrade," is a Finnish weekly paper for women. It has a circulation of about 5,000 and is doing good educational work among the women of that nationality. Articles sent out by the Woman's Department are published in this paper, and in every way it co-operates with the Woman's National Committee. (Address Toveritar, Tenth and Duane, Astoria, Ore.)

Life and Labor is a monthly magazine appealing especially to women engaged in the industries. It is the official organ of the Woman's Trade Union League and it is deserving of our recommendation and support. We should place it in the hands of all women, especially those who are working in industries that can be organized. (Address Life and Labor, 127 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.)

The Forerunner is another monthly magazine that is worthy of the attention of the Socialists. It is filled with vital truths, presented in a way that appeals to the average woman, whether in the home or out, young or old. Before the reader is aware of it, her ideas have changed from the old conservative viewpoint to the new radical revolutionary position. It is worth while for us to aid in the circulation of The Forerunner. (Address The Forerunner, 67 Wall Street, New York City.)

The Young Socialist Magazine is the only Socialist magazine for children in the United States. It contains educational articles and stories tending to teach the children of the working class a correct appreciation of the class struggle. It should be in the hands of every child in the Socialist movement. (Address The Young Socialist Magazine, 15 Spruce Street, New York City.)

The editors of all of the above magazines are Socialists.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITY.

At the present convention twenty-five women were elected regular delegates, which is a fair representation, being about one-tenth of the entire number of delegates.

For the first time the Woman's National Committee of the Socialist Party was represented by a fraternal delegate at the National Woman's Suffrage Convention, held at Louisville, Ky., on October 17, 1911.

For the first time Socialists took part in the congressional suffrage hearing held in Washington, March 13th. The Socialist Party was represented by three Socialist women. This was due to the fact that we now have a Socialist representative in Congress, and one of the suffrage resolutions before the House was presented by him.

For the first time Socialist women were elected as delegates to the International Socialist Congress, held at Copenhagen in August, 1911. Three women delegates from the United States attended this Congress, and one of them was chosen by the United States delegation to serve as its reporter of the proceedings.

SUMMARY.

It has taken but two years for the women to demonstrate the great value of their organized efforts in the work of the Socialist Party. The Socialist Party realizes as never before the absolute necessity of reaching the women with the message of Socialism. The National Executive Committee, the Woman's National Committee and the National Office are sparing no effort

in educating them to an understanding of their class interests and in bringing them into the party as dues-paying members, having the same duties and the same responsibilities as the men.

Not only are they educating the women, they are losing no opportunity to teach the men members of the party the senseless futility and the criminal ignorance manifested when one-half of the working class strives to free itself from slavery while leaving the other half in bondage. Women and men, not divided upon a basis of sex, but united upon the basis of working-class solidarity, are a necessary part of the working class program.

The educational results from carrying on a national equal suffrage campaign through the medium of a petition are incalculable. Thousands of men and women, with petitions and pencil in one hand and Socialist leaflets in the other, have gone from house to house, have invaded thousands of meetings and have carried on a tremendous agitation and education, not only for equal political rights for women and men, but for complete industrial freedom for the entire working class.

Within the organization of the Socialist Party the woman's committees have already proved to be a source of strength and power for good. Through their systematic work as regularly elected committees of their various locals they are bringing new life and social energy into the routine of the party work.

As a means of reaching the organized workers, whether it be during the stress of a great strike, or in the every-day work in their trades, the Socialist women have demonstrated their especial fitness to handle with class-conscious loyalty and unflinching tact the difficult situations that arise.

In the realm of practical politics they have proved themselves apt students. As watchers and clerks at the polls they have proved their ability not only to understand and carry out the instructions governing the elections, but to deport themselves with a quiet dignity that never fails to abolish coarse language or unmanly conduct.

In assisting in campaigns they falter at no task of endurance. No duty is too small, no task too great for them to attempt for the sake of the cause they love.

The Socialist woman is no longer an unknown quantity. She is an immeasurable constructive force in the growing working-class movement. In large numbers she is joining with the men of her class, and through their united efforts freedom for all humanity will be won.

The question of women and their work in the party is of more importance and should receive more careful consideration by the convention than ever before. The time is ripe for earnest discussion of the woman question. We should go from this convention with clearly defined ideas as to the best plans for educating the women in America to a class-conscious understanding of their needs and of enlisting them for active service in the great army of the working class—the Socialist Party.

Fraternaly submitted,
META BERGER,
WINNIE E. BRANSTETTER,
GRACE D. BREWER,
ELLA CARR,
LENA MORROW LEWIS,
MAY WOOD-SIMONS,
LUELLA TWINING,
Woman's National Committee.
CAROLINE A. LOWE,
General Correspondent.

APPENDIX J

Reports of the Majority and Minority Committees on Immigration.

(a) MAJORITY REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION.

At the national congress of the Socialist Party in 1910, the Committee on Immigration presented a majority report signed by Ernest Untermann, Joshua Wanhope and Victor L. Berger, and a minority report signed by John Spargo.

The majority report declared that the interests of the labor unions and of the Socialist Party of America demanded the enforcement of the existing exclusion laws which keep out the mass immigration or importation of Asiatic laborers.

The minority report declared that the danger from Asiatic labor immigration or importation was more imaginary than real and that, therefore, the Socialist Party should content itself with an emphasis upon the international solidarity of all working people regardless of nationality or race. The minority report did not state whether the Socialist Party should demand the repeal of the existing exclusion laws. When asked during the debate whether he favored the repeal of these laws, Comrade Spargo declined to commit himself to a definite answer.

In the course of the discussion, Comrade Morris Hillquit introduced a substitute for both reports. This substitute evaded the question for or against the existing exclusion laws, merely demanding that the mass of importation of contract laborers from all countries should be combated by the Socialist Party.

An amendment to this substitute, demanding a special emphasis upon the fact that the bulk of the Asiatic immigration was stimulated by the capitalists and for this reason should be excluded, was offered by Comrade Algernon Lee.

After a debate lasting nearly two days, the congress adopted Hillquit's substitute by a vote of 55 against 50.

This close vote induced the congress to recommit the question for further study to a new committee on immigration with instructions to report to the national convention of 1912.

In this new committee the same alignment immediately took place. After a fruitless effort of the chairman to get unanimous action, the majority decided to act by itself and let the minority do the same.

Continued study and the developments on the Pacific Coast during the last two years convinced the majority of this committee more than ever that the existing exclusion laws against Asiatic laborers should be enforced and be amended in such way that they can be more effectively enforced. The details of the necessary amendments should be worked out by our representatives, or by our future representatives, in Congress and submitted for ratification to the Committee

on Immigration, which should be made permanent for this purpose.

It does not matter whether Asiatic immigration is voluntary or stimulated by capitalists. There is no room for doubt that the capitalists welcome this immigration, and that its effect upon the economic and political class organizations of the American workers is destructive.

It is true that all foreign labor immigration lowers the standard of living, increases the unemployed problem and supplies the capitalists with uninformed and willing tools of reaction. But of all foreign labor immigration, the Asiatic element, owing to its social and racial peculiarities, is the most difficult to assimilate and mold into a homogeneous and effective revolutionary body. It is all the more dangerous to the most advanced labor organizations of this nation, because it adds to and intensifies the race issue which is already a grave problem in large sections of this country.

In the European countries the labor unions and the Socialist Party are not confronted by the task of educating, organizing and uniting vast masses of alien nationalities and races with the main body of the native class-conscious workers. Where alien immigration enters into the European labor problem, it plays but an insignificant role compared to the overwhelming mass of native workers. America is the only country in which the labor unions and the Socialist Party are compelled to face the problem of educating, organizing and uniting not only the native workers but a continually increasing army of foreign nationalities and races who enter this country without any knowledge of the English language, of American traditions, of economic and political conditions. The disappearance of the Western frontier has intensified the difficulties of labor organizations and Socialist propaganda to such a degree that it has become an unavoidable task to decide whether restrictive measures shall or shall not be demanded in the interests of the labor unions and of the Socialist Party. Since the race issue enters most prominently into this problem and has for years been the central point of restrictive legislation, the Socialist Party has been compelled to take notice of it.

Race feeling is not so much a result of social as of biological evolution. It does not change essentially with changes of economic systems. It is deeper than any class feeling and will outlast the capitalist system. It persists even after race prejudices has been outgrown. It exists, not because the capitalists nurse it for economic reasons, but the capitalists rather have an opportunity to nurse it for economic reasons because it exists as a product of biology. It is bound to play a role in the economics of the future society. If it should not assert itself in open warfare under a So-

cialist form of society, it will nevertheless lead to a rivalry of races for expansion over the globe as a result of the play of natural and sexual selection. We may temper this race feeling by education, but we can never hope to extinguish it altogether. Class-consciousness must be learned, but race-consciousness is inborn and cannot be wholly unlearned. A few individuals may indulge in the luxury of ignoring race and posing as utterly raceless humanitarians, but whole races never.

Where races struggle for the means of life, racial animosities cannot be avoided. Where working people struggle for jobs, self-preservation enforces its decrees. Economic and political considerations lead to racial fights and to legislation restricting the invasion of the white man's domain by other races.

The Socialist Party cannot avoid this issue. The exclusion of definite races, not on account of race, but for economic and political reasons, has been forced upon the old party statesmen in spite of the bitter opposition of the great capitalists.

Every addition of incompatible race elements to the present societies of nations or races strengthens the hands of the great capitalists against the rising hosts of class-conscious workers. But the race feeling is so strong that even the majority of old party statesmen have not dared to ignore it.

From the point of view of the class-conscious workers it is irrational in the extreme to permit the capitalists to protect their profits by high tariffs against the competition of foreign capital, and at the same time connive at their attempts to extend free trade in the one commodity which the laborer should protect more than any other, his labor power.

It is still more irrational to excuse this self-destructive policy by the slogan of international working class solidarity, for this sentimental solidarity works wholly into the hands of the capitalist class and injures the revolutionary movement of the most advanced workers of this nation, out of ill-considered worship of an Asiatic working class which is as yet steeped in the ideas of a primitive state of undeveloped capitalism.

A proper consideration of working class interests, to which the Socialist Party is pledged by all traditions and by all historical precedent, demands that our representatives in the legislative bodies of this nation should reduce the tariff protection of the capitalists and introduce a tariff, or tax, upon unwholesome competitors of the working class, regardless of whether these competitors are voluntary or subsidized immigrants. Real protection of American labor requires a tariff on labor power and the reduction and gradual abolition of the tariff on capital. Such labor legislation already exists in British Columbia and has proved effective there.

The argument that the menace of Asiatic labor immigration is more imaginary than real overlooks the obvious fact that this menace has been minimized and kept within bounds by the existing exclusion laws, and that it can be eliminated altogether by a strict enforcement and more up-to-date amendment of these laws.

The majority of this committee realize, of course, that the development of capitalism in China, India and Japan will necessarily tend to bring the American laborer into competition with the Asiatic laborer, even if the Asiatic does not come to the shores of this country. But the exclusion of the Asiatic from the shores of this country will

at least give to the American laborer the advantage of fighting the Asiatic competition at long range and wholly through international commerce, instead of having to struggle with the Asiatic laborer for jobs upon American soil. This will tend to abolish the labor of children and women in American factories, to maintain a rational standard of living and to reduce the unemployed problem for adult male workers.

International solidarity between the working people of Asia, Europe and America will be the outcome of international evolution, not of sentimental formulas. So long as the minds of the workers of nations and races are separated by long distances of industrial evolution, the desired solidarity cannot be completely realized, and while it is in process of realization, the demands of immediate self-preservation are more imperative than dreams of ideal solidarity.

The international solidarity of the working class can be most effectively demonstrated, not by mass immigration into each others' countries, but by the international co-operation of strong labor unions and of the national sections of the International Socialist Party.

Socialism proves itself a science to the extent that it enables us to foretell the actual tendencies of future development.

This is the general principle that guides us in the struggle against the capitalist classes of the world. We work for the transformation of capitalist into Socialist society, not so much because sentiment, longing, dogma or argument drive us, but because we are convinced that the dominant tendencies of capitalism work in the direction of Socialism.

This point of view has been almost wholly overlooked in the discussion and practice of these "immediate" policies which serve as our conscious steps in the direction of Socialism.

In our general propaganda and party organization, we work for the prophesied outcome of capitalist development and shape our actions in harmony with the foreseen probable course which the majority of the citizens will be compelled to adopt during the revolution of the human mind towards a Socialist consciousness.

Not so in discussing and acting upon questions of immediate policy, such as the exclusion of Asiatic laborers from the United States. Instead of clearly foretelling the inevitable policy which the majority of the voters of this nation will be compelled to adopt in this particular instance, we are supposed to shape our actions in response to sentimental, utopian or dogmatic arguments dictated by the personal likes or dislikes of a few individuals.

Instead of scientifically foretelling the inevitable logic of events, we are supposed to listen to a logic inspired by the sophistry of the advocates of unrestricted immigration.

Those who affirm the sentimental solidarity of the working classes the world over and at the same time demand a restriction of the stimulated mass importation of contract laborers admit unwillingly that this ideal solidarity is really impossible. And while they thus contradict their own sentimental assertion, they evade the real issue by an exaggerated reverence for a utopian race solidarity.

The common sense Socialist policy under these circumstances is to build up strong national labor unions and strong national Socialist parties in the different countries and work toward more perfect solidarity by an international co-operation of these labor unions and parties. To this end the So-

cialist Party of America should consider above all the interests of those native and foreign working class citizens whose economic and political class organizations are destined to be the dominant elements in the social revolution of this country.

In the United States this means necessarily the enforcement of the existing exclusion laws against Asiatic laborers, and the amendment of these laws in such a way that the working class of America shall fortify its strategic position in the struggle against the capitalist class.

The majority of this committee are not opposed to the social mingling of races through travel, education and friendly association upon terms of equality. But we are convinced that the mass of the voters, with the growth of social consciousness, will rather eliminate more and more those warring elements of social development which interfere with an orderly and systematic organization of industrial and political democracy. They will not be anxious to intensify the unemployed problem and the race issue, but will strive to transform the international working class solidarity from a utopian shibboleth into a constructive policy. They will use their collective intelligence to reduce the evils growing out of unemployment and race feeling, until we shall be able to eliminate those evils altogether and strip race feeling at least of its brutalities.

This tendency is so plainly evident to the majority of this committee that we can afford to dispense with appeals to passion. This question will not be solved by a repetition of phrases, but by a conscious and constructive policy which will enforce itself as an inevitable step in the direction of working class solidarity and Socialism the world over.

ERNEST UNTERMANN,
Chairman.
JOSHUA WANHOPE,
J. STITT WILSON,
ROBERT HUNTER.

(b) MINORITY REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION.

We, the undersigned, propose that this convention endorse the position taken on the question of immigration by the International Congress at Stuttgart.

(Signed) MEYER LONDON,
(Signed) JOHN SPARGO,
(Signed) LEO LAUKKI.

STATEMENT OF LEO LAUKKI OF THE MINORITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION.

The question to be decided is: "Shall the Socialist Party commit itself to the policy of exclusion of Asiatic labor from America and for what reasons?"

The majority report of the Committee on Immigration to the national congress in 1910, signed by Ernest Untermann, Victor Berger and Joshua Wanhope, members of said committee, declared that the interests of labor unions and of the Socialist Party demanded the enforcement of the existing exclusion laws which keep out the immigration of the Asiatic laborers. It therefore recommended to our party the policy of exclusion in regard to the immigration, and for reasons that will be stated here and analyzed.

The minority report to the same congress, signed by John Spargo, also a member of said committee, while assuming the danger from Asiatic immigration to be more imaginary than real, declared that the Socialist Party should content itself with an emphasis upon the international solidarity of

all working people regardless of nationality or race. But the question, Shall the Socialist Party in the principle and hence in practice, commit itself to the policy of exclusion or shall it not, Comrade Spargo evaded and so left it undecided by declaring (from the floor) that—

"If the time comes when we, after serious, honest, conscientious and prolonged effort, have to say we have failed and we cannot do it, and in protection of ourselves we must close the doors to the Asiatic, I shall be ready to close the doors. If it comes to the time when we must close the door to the Italian, I shall be ready to close the door. If the time comes when we have got to close the door against men of my own race, I shall say: We must close the door. But that time is not yet."

The majority report declared the time to be here already and so the minority report was done, it lost all its force by that declaration of Comrade Spargo.

Adopting the substitute resolution presented by Comrade Morris Hillquit, which totally evaded the question to be decided, only demanding that the party should combat the mass importation of contract laborers from all countries, the congress referred the question back to the committee with instructions to report to the national convention in 1912.

Since that time there has been drafted by Comrade Ernest Untermann and signed by Comrades Robert Hunter, Joshua Wanhope and J. Stitt Wilson, a majority report, which in the main follows the same lines as the majority report to the congress of 1910 and declares in favor of exclusional policy.

There will be also a minority report to be presented by Comrade Spargo, but up to date it has not been sent to the undersigned and therefore it cannot be referred to.

The demand that the Socialist Party should declare itself in regard to the Asiatic or other immigration labor in favor of exclusion is based upon the following two assumptions:

1. That the strategic position of the American working class in its struggle with capitalism and against the capitalist class will be better if the Asiatic immigrant labor will be excluded from the United States, or vice versa, that the immigration of Asiatic labor places the American working class strategically more or less in a disadvantageous position to successfully combat the American capitalist class, to maintain its standard of living, or better its conditions.

2. That the Asiatic laborers in contradistinction to the laborers of all other nationalities immigrating to United States are racially unable to be arrayed in the ranks of American working class against the capitalist exploitation and oppression; that in regard of them it is impossible for our party to accept the same policy as in regard of other immigrant nationalities—the Scandinavians, the Slavs, the Southern Europeans, the Balkans and others; that we cannot accept the policy of organizing the Asiatics economically and politically, because they are of a "backward race."

According to the first assumption the American working class with the purpose to gain the most advantageous strategic position against the capitalist class should second itself from the competition of Asiatic labor by trying to erect barriers, real "Chinese walls." In the form of exclusion laws against the Asiatic working men and women compelled by the iron laws of economic evolution to leave their native land.

At the same time it shows the folly of assuming that "an international question can be solved through national seclusion."

It is the irony of fate that, the same nation that has been the foremost tool of capitalist evolution in breaking down the hundred years' old walls of China by opening its ports and gates for the European and American merchandise, capital, money and labor and so teaching the Asiatics the omnipotence of economic evolution, teaching them that their great walls and seclusion avail to nothing before international capitalism, it is really a big irony of fate that now the same nation in these days of the triumph of international capitalism over the thousand years old seclusionary culture of China in the Chinese revolution, takes up that worn idea from the Chinese and yells: "We want seclusion!" We want a Chinese wall around the dear United States to keep out all those foreigners to save our culture and our standard of living from their destroying competition."

There are many reasons which prove that the working class cannot successfully fight capitalism isolated, secluded in national or other units, closed between national boundaries, and the main reason is, that the economic evolution does not tolerate any barriers and boundaries. It leaps over them—they may have been constructed of the best kind of steel and beaten or written in as many statute books as there are in the United States. For the capitalism of the present day the Pacific Ocean is only a pond and the keeping of Asiatic laborers on that side of the Pacific has almost as much meaning economically for the strategic position of the American working class as were the Asiatics living in Canada.

The idea that seclusion will give a nation an advantage in its relation to other nations is as old as the earth, and evolution has always shown it to be fallacious.

So in the history of social life this idea has been many times tried and shown to be utopian, conservative and often reactionary in its workings. The many communistic societies of last century tried here and in Europe were only unsuccessful experiments with this idea of solving the social question by seclusion from the whole outer world, isolated from it in all possible ways.

Also the "closed for non-relatives and for non-acquaintances, pure and simple, craft unions" are another experiment with this seclusion idea, and the McNamara case shows how successfully it works. The whole American Federation of Labor can be said to lack force and power only because it is ridden by the idea that as many workers as possible should be out of its unions. "Let us exclude as many as possible from our trade and our union and we can maintain our wage scale," is the slogan of every craft union. And what is economic evolution now teaching to the isolated craftsmen who have secluded themselves behind their big initiation fees? Every one of you knows. May it only be said here that the idea of excluding the Asiatic laborers from America is the same idea and emanates before this convention from the garbage pile of outworn ideas of the A. F. of L.

In the class struggle the working class gets its strength and power relative to the capitalist class from the industrial evolution. It gets it from the position it holds in the industrial production and distribution, from the dependence of the social life upon it, and not from the racial or national character of the working class. If the economic evolution of a nation is backward, its working people have very little power and strength; it may then, nationally and linguistically, be as homogeneous a whole as can be, e. g., the Japanese working class. Vice versa, a working class nationally het-

erogeneous can be unconquerable if only it is in a commanding economic relation to the capitalist class and to society as a whole; for example, Lawrence, Mass.

Therefore, the American working class can as well maintain its position against the capitalists, better its conditions and force the enemy out of business be there Asiatic workers in its ranks or not. The industrial position it occupies, and that only, gives it all the force it needs. And at the same time this same industrial evolution can transform the Asiatic immigrant laborer to an American industrial proletarian by forcing him ahead in the fight against capitalism, by forcing him to join the forces working for the organization, education and emancipation of the proletariat, by forcing him to be just as worthy an ally to the American workers of the other nationalities as they are to each other. The Asiatics when thrown into the industrial mills of America cannot forever remain Asiatics; they will get the habits of the American industrial worker; they will undergo the same sufferings in the same hell and so into their hearts will grow the same hatred and the same desires as in the hearts of the Western workers. Economic life itself arrays them against capitalism. **THEY CAN AND THEY WILL BE ORGANIZED AGAINST THE CAPITALIST CLASS, BOTH IN THEIR NATIVE LAND AND IN AMERICA, EVERYWHERE, WHERE THEY BECOME INDUSTRIAL PROLETARIATS.**

To understand that this policy of seclusion will not at all strengthen the strategic position of the American working class relative to its exploiter, we must only think what an absurdity it would be to claim that if the Asiatics were excluded from the United States, the standard of living of the American working class would rise, the American workers would then be able to win so and so much concessions from their exploiter, the international capitalism. Everyone understands that competition of Asiatic labor in America does not decide the wages and the standard of living of the American working class, but that the mode of production and distribution, the evolution of the industrial life decides it. If the industrial life develops in the direction that it does not need as intelligent, well-fed and well-educated labor power as before, the wages and standard of living will go down; capitalism will force them down either by using cheap paid foreigners or native labor, the women and children. And vice versa, if the industrial evolution develops in such a way as to necessitate general forward evolution of the proletariat, demands more and more intelligence, education, physical and psychical power of the working class, as we socialists believe that it does and upon which scientific knowledge all our hope of the future supremacy of working class relies, in that the standard of living cannot be forced down by immigrant labor competition or otherwise. On the contrary, the industrial life will raise the immigrant labor to the same higher standard demanded by the economical production itself. All the talk that the Asiatics force down the standard of living of the American working class is only an echo from the disappearing of the craftsman before the industrial worker. While that is a fact, it does not mean that the standard of living of the whole American working class is going down. On the contrary, it is the craft worker who, with his seclusion ideas, is swept aside by the industrial evolution and who, not understanding this evolu-

tion, like a King Canute, tries, by all kinds of silly means, to bid the tide of evolution stay back, and so he also yells out to the wide world, "Look here, what the Asiatics do; they force down our (he doesn't say "my") standard of living. Exclude them!" And the echo (the merely vote catchers) answers, "Really, they force down the standard of living of the American working class. Exclude them!" And this they call scientific Socialism!

To prove this, it suffices only to mention the fact that the common laborers in the Western States, where this Asiatic immigration is acute, in general do not join in the cry, "Exclude the Asiatics." They do not even give any notice to the whole question; it does not exist for them. The same applies to the foreigners, at least to the Finnish laborers working in the Pacific coast mines, sawmills, lumber camps and as fishers. They haven't any such silly ideas that especially the Asiatics lower the standard of living of the American working class. When they lack work and fair wages they seek for the reasons elsewhere, in the industrial conditions of the time and in the fact that the native-born workers, for the reason of their isolated craft's position, are keeping the American working class weak; it is in a state of almost paradoxical disorganization and conservatism.

For us Socialists it is not merely sentimentalism to believe that the industrial proletariat, be he of what race or nationality whatever, will be arrayed and organized against capitalism to fight the capitalist class both economically and politically; but it is a scientific fact, upon which our whole movement is founded, and it has by history past and present, so amply been proven to be true, that there is needed an overwhelming mass of facts to overthrow it, and not merely assumptions, which are the main content of the majority report to this and the preceding convention.

Our party must remember, before the policy presented by the majority report can be warranted, that both it and the unions have done practically nothing in regard to the Asiatic laborers in the other way. They have not even tried to organize the Asiatic laborers, any more than they have tried to organize the other foreign workers of the United States, and still they have courage to claim that the Asiatics cannot be organ-

ized. At least before our party in this question can refute its basic principles and declare itself in favor of a policy which is mainly sought for only by the blind clamor of disappearing craft workers and small traders of the Pacific coast, it must try the other way; it must try to reach the Asiatics as well as all other nationalities in the United States by its ideas and organization.

Therefore the only recommendation that can be made to this convention in regard to the Asiatic laborer is:

"That the Socialist party place an organizer among these Asiatic workers who can speak their languages and in every other way try to help the Asiatics to become acquainted with the Socialist ideas and movement and to form a national Asiatic Socialist organization along the same lines that the other nationalities are organized.

"That the Socialist party declare itself in opposition to the discrimination against Asiatic workers, politically or otherwise, and demand for them the same civil and political rights which it demands for other races and nationalities in the United States."

What becomes of the fact that Asiatics as well as other foreign and native workers, especially women and children, are exploited by the American capitalists as so-called cheap labor, to replace the higher paid craft workers and so throwing them out into the ranks of the industrial proletariat? It cannot be hindered in the least by any reactionary policy of the dying semi-bourgeoisie and craftsmen. But this cheap paid industrial proletariat can be hindered from selling its labor power too cheap; it can and it will be induced to raise its standard of wages, to better its working and living conditions by the general policy of our party, of which the most effective in this regard will be the demand—

For a general eight-hour working day.

For a minimum wage scale.

It will be self-evident that when the length of the day and the compensation for the work are stipulated by general laws, backed and enforced by the workers themselves, there will be no possibility nor reason for any capitalist to employ cheap labor. The effects of the cheap labor will disappear only in this way.

LEO LAUKKI.

APPENDIX K

Report of Committee on Municipal and State Program.

PREAMBLE.

Socialism cannot be carried into full effect while the Socialist Party is a minority party. Nor can it be inaugurated in any single city. Furthermore, so long as national and state legislatures and particularly the courts are in the control of the capitalist class, a municipal administration even though absolutely controlled by Socialists, will be hampered, crippled and restricted in every possible way.

We maintain that the evils of the present system will be removed only when the working class wholly abolish private ownership in the social means of production, collectively assume the management of the industries and operate them for use and not for profit, for the benefit of all and not for the enrichment of a privileged class. In this the Socialist Party stands alone in the political field.

But the Socialist Party also believes that the evils of the modern system may be materially relieved and their final disappearance may be hastened by the introduction of social, political and economic measures which will have the effect of bettering the lives, strengthening the position of the workers and curbing the power and domination of the capitalists.

The Socialist Party therefore supports the struggles of the working class against the exploitation and oppression of the capitalist class, and is vitally concerned in the efficiency of the parliamentary and administrative means for the fighting of the class struggle.

Furthermore, it should be distinctly understood that the following suggested municipal and state program is not put forth as mandatory or binding upon the state or local organizations. It is offered as suggestive data to assist those localities that may desire to use it, and as a basis for the activities of Socialist members of state legislatures and local administrations.

STATE PROGRAM.

I.

Labor Legislation.

- (1) An eight-hour day, trades union scale and minimum wage for both sexes.
- (2) Legalization of the right to strike, picket and boycott.
- (3) Abolition of the injunction as a means of breaking strikes and the establishment of trial by jury in all labor disputes.
- (4) Prohibition of the use of the military and the police power to break strikes.
- (5) Prohibition of the employment of private detective agencies and police forces in labor disputes.
- (6) The repeal of all military law which surrenders the power of the governor over the militia to the federal authorities.
- (7) Requirements that in time of labor disputes advertisements for help published

by employers shall contain notice of the fact that such labor dispute exists. Provision to be made for the prosecution of persons who shall employ workers without informing them that such labor trouble exists.

(8) Prohibition of employment of children under the age of sixteen, compulsory education, and the pensioning of widows with minor children where such provision is necessary.

(9) The organization of state employment agencies and rigid control of private agencies.

(10) Suitable safeguards and sanitary regulations in all occupations with ample provision for frequent and effective inspection of places of employment, machinery and appliances.

(11) Old age pensions, sick benefits and accident insurance to be established.

(12) Workingmen's compensation laws to be carefully drawn to protect labor.

II.

Home rule for cities.

III.

Public Education.

(1) Compulsory education of both sexes up to the age of sixteen years with adequate provision for further courses where desired.

(2) Establishment of vocational and continuation schools and manual training for both sexes.

(3) Free text books for teachers and pupils; uniform text books on all subjects to be furnished free to public schools.

(4) Physical training through systematic courses of gymnastics and open air exercises. Open air schools and playgrounds.

IV.

TAXATION.

(1) A graduated income tax; wages and salaries up to \$2,000 to be exempt.

(2) Graduated inheritance tax.

(3) All land held for speculation and all land not occupied or used by the owners to be taxed up to full rental value.

V.

PUBLIC WORKS AND CONSERVATION.

(1) For the purpose of developing and preserving the natural resources of the state and offering additional opportunities of labor to the unemployed, the states shall undertake a comprehensive system of public works, such as the building of roads, canals, and the reclamation and irrigation of land. All forests, mineral lands, water ways and natural resources now owned by the states to be conserved and kept for public use.

(2) The contract system shall be abolished in all public works, such work to be done by the state directly, all labor to be employed not more than eight hours per

day at trade union wages and under the best possible working conditions.

VI.

LEGISLATION.

(1) The legislature of the state to consist of one house of representatives.

(2) The initiative, referendum and recall to be enacted.

VII.

EQUAL SUFFRAGE.

(1) Unrestricted political rights for men and women.

(2) Resident qualification for all elections not to exceed 90 days.

(3) The right to vote, not to be contingent upon the payment of any taxes, either in money or labor.

VIII.

AGRICULTURE.

(1) Extension of the State Agricultural and experimental farms for crop culture, for the distribution of improved seeds, for the development of fertilizers, for the design and introduction of the best types of farm machinery, and for the encouragement of the breeding of superior types of stock.

(2) All land owned by the state to be retained, and other land brought into public ownership and use by reclamation, purchase, condemnation, taxation or otherwise: Such land to be organized into socially operated farms for the conduct of collective agricultural enterprises.

(3) Landlords to assess their own lands, the state reserving the right to purchase such lands at the assessed value.

(4) State insurance against pestilence, diseases of animals and plants and against natural calamities.

IX.

DEFECTIVES AND DELINQUENTS.

(1) The present unsentimental and brutal method of treating criminal persons, defectives and delinquents to be replaced by modern scientific and humane methods. This to include the abolition of all death penalties, of the prison contract system, of isolated confinement. Penal institutions to be located in rural localities with adequate healthful open air employment and humane treatment.

MUNICIPAL PROGRAM.

I.

LABOR MEASURES.

(1) Eight hour day, trade union wages and conditions in all public employment and on all contract work done for the city.

(2) Old age pension, accident insurance and sick benefits to be provided for all public employees.

(3) Special laws for the protection of both women and children, in mercantile, domestic and industrial pursuits.

(4) The abolition of child labor.

(5) Police not to be used to break strikes.

(6) Rigid inspection of factories by local authorities for the improvement of sanitary conditions, lighting, ventilating, heating and the like. Safety appliances required in all cases to protect the worker against dangerous machinery.

(7) Free employment bureaus to be established in the cities to work in co-operation with state bureaus. Abolition of contract system and direct employment by the city on all public works.

(8) Free legal advice.

(9) The provision of work for the unemployed by the erection of model dwell-

ings for workingmen; the paving and improvement of streets and alleys, and the extension and improvement of parks and playgrounds.

II.

HOME RULE.

(1) Home rule for cities; including the right of the City to own and operate any and all public utilities; to engage in commercial enterprises of any and all kinds; the right of excess condemnation, both within and outside the City and the right of two or more cities to co-operate in the ownership and management of public utilities; the City to have the right of issuing bonds for these purposes up to 50% of the assessed valuation, or the right to issue mortgage certificates against the property acquired, said certificates not to count against the bonded indebtedness of the City.

III.

MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP.

(1) The City to acquire as rapidly as possible, own and operate its public utilities, especially street car systems, light, heat, and power plants, docks, wharves, etc. Among the things which may be owned and operated by the City to advantage are slaughter houses, bakeries, milk depots, coal and wood yards, ice plants, undertaking establishments and crematoriums.

On all public works, eight hour day trade union wages and progressive improvement in the condition of labor to be established and maintained.

IV.

CITY PLATTING, PLANNING AND HOUSING.

(1) The introduction of scientific city planning to provide for the development of cities along the most sanitary, economic and attractive lines.

(2) The City to secure the ownership of land, to plat the same so as to provide for plenty of open space and to erect model dwellings thereon to be rented by the municipality at cost.

(3) Transportation facilities to be maintained with special reference to the prevention of overcrowding in insanitary tenements and the creation of slum districts.

V.

PUBLIC HEALTH.

(1) Inspection of food.

(2) Sanitary inspection.

(3) Extension of hospital and free medical treatment.

(4) Child welfare department, to combat infant death rate prevailing especially in working class sections.

(5) Special attention to eradication of tuberculosis and other contagious diseases.

(6) System of street toilets and public comfort stations.

(7) Adequate system of public baths, parks, playgrounds and gymnasiums.

VI.

PUBLIC EDUCATION.

(1) Adequate number of teachers so that classes may not be too large.

(2) Retirement fund for teachers.

(3) Kindergartens to be established and conducted in connection with all schools.

(4) Adequate school buildings to be provided and maintained.

(5) Ample playgrounds with instructors in charge.

(6) Free text books and equipment.

(7) Penny lunches, and where necessary, free meals and clothing.

(8) Medical inspection including free service in the care of eyes, ears, throat, teeth and general health where necessary to insure mental efficiency in the educational work, and special inspection to protect the schools from contagion.

(9) Baths and gymnasiums in each school.

(10) Establishment of vacation schools and adequate night schools for adults.

(11) All school buildings to be open or available for the citizens of their respective communities, at any and all times and for any purposes desired by the citizens, so long as such use does not interfere with the regular school work. All schools to serve as centers for social, civic and recreational purposes.

VII.

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC AND VICE.

(1) Socialization of the liquor traffic; the city to offer as substitute for the social features of the saloon, opportunities for recreation and amusement, under wholesome conditions.

(2) Abolition of the restricted vice districts.

VIII.

MUNICIPAL MARKETS.

Municipal markets to be established where it is found that by this means a reduction may be secured in the cost of the necessities of life.

PERMANENT COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL AND STATE PROGRAM RECOMMENDED.

Your committee would recommend that the Convention appoint a permanent committee of seven on state and municipal affairs. The purpose of the committee to be to study the problems involved in municipal and state legislation, collect information and data bearing thereon and to submit to the next National Congress suggestions and recommendations for municipal and state activities and program. The committee should have power to fill vacancies that may occur on their committee.

STUDY OF UNEMPLOYMENT RECOMMENDED.

The Committee on Municipal and State Program, to which was referred the following resolution relative to the study of the problem of the unemployed, unanimously recommended its adoption:

By Winfield R. Gaylord, of Wisconsin.
Whereas, The problem of unemployment has been recognized by reports of federal and state authorities to be one of the primary problems of our civilization; and

Whereas, The formulation of definite demands for the remedying of the conditions of unemployment must be based upon definite information as to the conditions and facts of unemployment in this country; and

Whereas, Labor organizations in other countries have established a statistical basis of the facts relating to the unemployment of their own members and the workers in their respective industries, which facts have become the basis of a definite program for the relief of the unemployed by means of state and municipal aid and the institution of national channels for reducing unemployment; and

Whereas, There is no body of information available relating to the conditions of employment in the organized industries, so far as the offices of the national international unions are concerned, and only two or three states have undertaken any seri-

ous investigation of the facts relating to this subject; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Socialist Party does hereby urge upon the various state organizations the imperative necessity of pressing the matter of an official investigation by state authorities of the facts and conditions of unemployment in the various states of the union upon some uniform basis as to method; and be it also

Resolved, That the Socialist Party also urges upon the executive heads of the various labor organizations the importance of keeping and tabulating accurate records of the conditions of employment in their respective trades and industries upon some common and uniform basis as to method. Be it also

Resolved, That the National Secretary of the Socialist Party be instructed to forward copies of these resolutions to the secretaries of the various labor organizations and federations, state, national and international.

ESTABLISHMENT OF LEGISLATIVE BUREAU RECOMMENDED.

The Committee on Municipal and State Program, to which was referred the following resolution relative to the establishment of a Legislative Bureau, introduced by W. R. Gaylord of Wisconsin, unanimously recommend its adoption:

Whereas, It is more than likely that there will be representatives of the Socialist Party in twelve or more state legislatures after the fall elections; with scores of municipal officers already elected and scores more to be elected; and

Whereas, The majority of these representatives will be without adequate information or aid in the preparation of proper material for their legislative work in most of the states; and

Whereas, It is desirable that there should be as far as possible a unity of purpose and program in the work of the various Socialist legislative groups, which can be attained only by securing some definite method and channel of co-operation to that end; and

Whereas, It is impossible even now for the Socialist municipal officers and members of legislative groups having experience to comply with the demands made upon them in this direction; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there shall be created a department which shall be known as the Legislative Bureau of the Socialist Party, to be placed in charge of a capable secretary with adequate training for that work; the salaries and expenses of the office to be regulated by the N. E. C. Be it further

Resolved, That it shall be the duty of this bureau to secure all possible information from sources in this and other countries, such as shall be of help to the various state and municipal elected officials of the Socialist Party, and to furnish this information on request to these officials or to other local, state or national officers of the Socialist Party; and to render such aid as may be convenient in the matter of drafting legislative propositions.

RESOLUTIONS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE.

Your committee on municipal and state program to which was referred the following resolution by Comrade Simmons of New York, proposing that the National Convention adopt the general plan of Socialist control proposed by Local Glenville, New York, would recommend that the same be referred to the permanent committee on

municipal and state program for further consideration and later recommendation:

PLAN FOR SOCIALIST CONTROL.

Whereas, Socialists are constantly reproached for having no definite plan of procedure in taking over the means of production and distribution, and

Whereas, The increasing participation of Socialists in Government makes the formulation of some definite plan of Socialist control more and more imperative, be it therefore

Resolved, By the Socialist Party of America in convention assembled that the

"General Plan of Socialist Control" proposed by Local Glenville, of the Socialist Party be endorsed and adopted.

Respectfully submitted,
CARL D. THOMPSON, Chairman,
ANNA A. MALEY,
JOHN C. KENNEDY,
THOS. M. TODD,
W. W. FARMER,
GEO. W. DOWNING,
MARGUERITE PREVEY,
ERNEST BERGER,
R. E. DOOLEY.

APPENDIX L

Report of National Secretary.

To the National Convention of the Socialist Party:

Dear Comrades:—I submit a summary of the principal phases of our party's progress, together with recommendations for the future.

FINANCES.

A complete record of the finances of the National Office is to be found in the monthly financial statements contained in the Monthly Bulletins, in the annual reports made at the close of each year and in the audits published from time to time. I shall not repeat the figures here.

LITERATURE.

The average amount of money per month received at the National Office for literature, as far back as the records show, is as follows:

1904 average per month.....	\$ 349.99
1905 average per month.....	42.23
1906 average per month.....	188.49
1907 average per month.....	117.84
1908 average per month.....	142.88
1909 average per month.....	481.41
1910 average per month.....	663.95
1911 average per month.....	1,158.30
1912 average for first three months	1,158.30

Thus far in 1912 the National Office published the following literature:
300,000 National Platforms.
1,000,000 copies of "The Growing Grocery Bill," by Allan L. Benson.
2,000,000 leaflets.

It is my opinion that the greatest mission of the National Office in the future is to be the publisher and disseminator of Socialist Literature. Such activity is distinctly a national matter. The only question involved is whether it shall be done by private concerns or by the organization. In the annual report in January I expressed the opinion that the National Office ought to become the greatest, if not the only, publisher of Socialist literature. The only objections I have heard since then have come from private publishers. Their ostensible reason for objecting is that it might result in paternalism within the party. This is identically the same objection which our enemies make against Socialism. And it is equally as fallacious. Just as we propose to prevent Socialism from developing paternalism by surrounding it with safeguards, so also we can and will prevent the party from developing paternalism by surrounding it with safeguards. It is already surrounded with safeguards, for that matter, but if we need more, let us have more. Instead of trying to make the clock of progress run backward.

There need not be the slightest hostility toward the private publishers. The National Office should absorb them on terms

which will be fair to all. It is a waste of time and energy to investigate the private concerns, except in so far as it calls attention to the fact that the party should be its own publisher. They have done good work, and the party has no right to object to their activities so long as it does not supply the demand for literature itself.

When the National Office goes into the literature business in earnest, the private publishers will come to it, asking to be absorbed. They can no more compete with the National Office than a private postoffice could compete with the government.

The National Constitution already authorizes the publishing of Socialist literature by the National Office. Unless the convention takes action to the contrary, it will be taken for granted that the constitution also authorizes the installation of a printing plant by the National Office in order to publish literature to better advantage, in case it should be more economical. It will undoubtedly be more economical if the literature business of the office is expanded as herein suggested.

ORGANIZATION AND AGITATION.

Of late, in order not to interfere with arrangements made by the state organizations, the dates for national lecturers and organizers have not been made by the National Office, except in cases of foreign speaking organizers whose dates have been arranged by the National Translator-Secretaries. The plan has been to assign organizers to states where needed, the National Office paying the deficits.

At the time of the national congress of 1910, six of the states were unorganized, namely: Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Mississippi. Virginia became an organized state in October, 1910; Georgia, in January, 1911; Mississippi, in July, 1911, and North Carolina, in March, 1912.

Of the two remaining unorganized states, Delaware has six locals.

South Carolina has nine locals and eight members at large. It is probable that a state organization will be formed soon.

The unorganized territory of Alaska has fourteen locals and four members at large. It is probable that a territorial organization will be formed there soon.

In January, 1912, the District of Columbia separated from the State organization of Maryland and received a charter of its own, having the same rights as a state organization.

In Porto Rico we have one local.

In the Canal Zone we have a number of members at large.

LYCEUM DEPARTMENT.

The lyceum subscription lecture course plan has been very successful from the

standpoint of education and from the standpoint of organization. It has put thousands of Socialist books and pamphlets into circulation. It has put thousands of subscriptions on the mailing lists of the Socialist publications. It has attracted thousands of new hearers to listen to an explanation of what Socialism is, what it has done, and what it proposes to do. And it has increased the membership and the efficiency of the locals adopting it. The greatest credit must be given to L. E. Katterfeld, head of the department.

Whether or not the lyceum plan shall be continued depends upon the policy to be adopted by the convention. If the convention decides that the lecture work should be handled by the National Office, it should be continued. If on the other hand, the convention decides that lecture work should be in the hands of the state organizations, the National Office should entirely cease touring any speakers except the candidates for president and vice-president and foreign speaking lecturers and organizers.

I can see good arguments on both sides, and I am indifferent as to which course is taken. But, if the National Office is to continue the plan, it should be done with the specific sanction of the convention and with the definite shall have the right to decrease the efficiency of the course by keeping it out of the state. Either give the National Office a free hand or none at all.

In case the plan is continued, it should be so modified that the locals will be anxious to accept it, instead of having to be coaxed to do so.

It should also be so modified that any live local, no matter how small, could take advantage of it.

It should also be so modified that the locals will make a payment in advance. This is necessary for two reasons. First, because the National Office must not be compelled to practically suspend all other activities for several months in order to pay the preliminary expense of the Lyceum Department, as it did last year. Second, in order to guard against loss when locals cancel their contracts.

It would also necessarily have to be modified so that the wages of the lecturers would be three dollars per day and expenses, unless the convention, and later the membership by referendum vote, decided to increase them. The three-dollar rate was fixed by referendum vote of the membership. The constitutional provision for special lecturers paying a commission to the National Office does not apply to the Lyceum lecturers. I have no objection to their wages being rate, but I do not think they ought to be increased to equal the rate paid this year. If any increase is made, it should also apply to national organizers and lecturers and to the heads of departments in the National Office. It is, of course, unjust to pay a Lyceum lecturer who makes the high places and stops at the best hotels higher wages than we pay to a pioneer organizer who makes the hard places and puts up with all manner of hardship and inconvenience. And as for the heads of departments, while their employment may be a trifle more steady, they have equally hard work and much greater responsibility.

A separate report for the Lyceum Department will be made by L. E. Katterfeld, head of the department, and I request

that he be given a hearing when the matter comes up for discussion, although he is not a delegate.

WOMAN'S DEPARTMENT.

This department has developed constantly since it was made a part of the work of the National Office by the National Congress of 1910. It has demonstrated its value to the cause of woman's emancipation, under the direction of the Woman's National Committee and the General Correspondent, Caroline A. Lowe.

And well it may. For Socialism would not be worth having if it left half the race enslaved. The awakening of woman is one of the most hopeful signs of the times. Our Woman's Department is playing an important part, and is destined to play a still more important part, in securing the triumph of the woman's movement and of Socialism.

A number of States have state correspondents and the locals and branches are electing women's committees to carry on special propaganda among the women and children. The monthly programs have been widely used. Hundreds of thousands of leaflets have been put into circulation. Special women's organizers have been sent into the field. Special articles have been furnished to the press. A petition for equal suffrage was gathered.

A teachers' bureau is also conducted in connection with the Woman's Department, the object of which is to put Socialist teachers and Socialist school boards or patrons in touch with each other.

A separate report for the Woman's Department will be made by the Woman's National Committee.

MEMBERSHIP.

The Socialist Party was organized early in August, 1901. The records are too incomplete to determine just how many members we had in the years 1901 and 1902. The membership for each year since then, based on the average dues received, is as follows:

1903	15,975
1904	20,763
1905	23,327
1906	26,784
1907	29,270
1908	41,751
1909	41,479
1910	58,011
1911	84,716
1912 (first three months).....	125,826

The number of locals and branches is approximately five thousand.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

Since the National Congress of 1910 and the party referendum following the same, the national constitution has been amended by referendum vote as follows:

Referendum "A," 1911, by Hallettsville, Texas, adding a new section (Section 3) to Article III, relating to the election of National Officers annually, and limiting the number of terms of office to two, was adopted April 19, 1911, by a vote of 9,050 to 8,511—majority 539.

Referendum "B," 1911, by Local New York, striking out the limiting of terms clause in Section 3, Article III, was adopted by a vote of 11,057 to 7,428—majority 3,629.

THE SOCIALIST VOTE.

The vote in each state, beginning with the Social Democratic party vote of 1900, up to and including the vote of 1910, is as follows:

	1900.	1902.	1904.	1906.	1908.	1910.
Alabama	928	2,312	1,853	389	1,399	1,633
Arizona	27	510	1,304	1,995	1,912	1,912
Arkansas	27	1,816	1,816	2,164	5,842	9,196
California	7,572	9,592	29,533	17,515	28,659	47,819
Colorado	634	7,177	4,304	16,938	7,974	9,603
Connecticut	1,029	2,804	4,543	3,005	5,113	12,179
Delaware	57	145	145	149	240	556
Florida	603	2,337	2,530	3,747	10,204	10,204
Georgia	197	98	98	584	224	224
Idaho	1,567	4,954	5,711	5,400	5,791	5,791
Illinois	9,687	20,167	69,225	42,005	34,711	49,896
Indiana	2,374	7,111	12,013	7,824	13,476	19,632
Iowa	2,742	6,360	14,847	8,901	8,287	9,635
Kansas	1,605	4,078	15,494	8,796	12,420	16,994
Kentucky	770	1,683	3,602	1,819	4,185	5,234
Louisiana	995	603	603	2,538	706	706
Maine	878	1,973	2,106	1,553	1,758	1,641
Maryland	903	499	2,247	3,106	2,323	3,924
Massachusetts	9,716	33,629	13,604	20,699	10,781	14,444
Michigan	2,326	4,271	8,941	5,994	11,586	10,608
Minnesota	3,065	1,143	11,692	14,445	14,527	18,363
Mississippi	393	173	173	978	23	23
Missouri	6,128	5,335	13,009	11,528	15,431	19,957
Montana	708	3,131	5,676	4,638	5,855	5,412
Nebraska	823	3,157	7,412	3,763	3,524	6,721
Nevada	790	1,057	925	1,251	2,103	3,637
New Hampshire	4,609	1,057	1,090	1,011	1,299	1,072
New Jersey	12,869	4,541	9,587	7,766	10,249	10,134
New Mexico	12,869	23,400	162	211	1,056	1,056
New York	518	23,400	36,333	25,943	38,451	48,982
North Carolina	1,245	1,245	124	345	345	437
North Dakota	4,847	14,270	2,017	1,689	2,421	5,114
Ohio	815	1,963	36,260	18,432	33,795	62,356
Oklahoma	1,495	3,771	4,443	4,040	21,779	24,707
Oregon	4,331	3,771	7,651	17,032	7,339	19,475
Pennsylvania	1,495	21,910	21,863	18,736	33,913	59,639
Rhode Island	956	416	22	32	1,365	529
South Carolina	22	32	22	32	100	70
South Dakota	169	2,738	3,138	2,542	2,346	1,675
Tennessee	410	1,354	1,637	1,637	1,870	4,571
Texas	1,846	3,615	2,791	3,065	7,870	11,538
Utah	717	3,069	5,767	3,010	4,895	4,889
Vermont	371	844	512	547	1,067	1,067
Virginia	145	155	218	255	987	987
Washington	2,006	4,739	10,023	8,717	14,177	15,994
West Virginia	268	1,572	2,611	2,611	3,679	8,152
Wisconsin	7,095	15,970	28,220	24,916	28,164	40,053
Wyoming	552	1,077	1,077	1,827	1,715	2,155
Total	96,934	223,494	409,230	331,043	424,483	607,674

ELECTED OFFICIALS.

Our successes at the polls are too familiar to need elaboration. The number of elected officials, which was very slight two years ago, has now increased to goodly proportions. Strange as it may seem, it is difficult to secure accurate information on this subject. As nearly as we were able to obtain the data, there were 1,039 of them in office at the beginning of the present year, classified as to the nature of their offices as follows:

Auditors (city)	10
Attorneys (city)	4
Aldermen	145
Assessors	61
Collectors	2
Commissioners (city and township)	9
Commissioners (street)	1
Commissioners (park)	2
Commissioners (charter)	5
Commissioners (public works)	1
Congressmen	1
Clerks (city, township and county)	25
Clerks (court)	1
Coroners	7
Councilmen	160
Comptrollers	3
Constables	57
Directors	1
Election Officials	45
Judges (civil)	2

Justices of the Peace	55
Listers	2
Magistrates	1
Marshals	18
Mayors	56
Members of Constitutional Convention	1
Pound Keepers	4

POLICE OFFICIALS:

Police Magistrates	3
Police Judges	15
Officers	4

Presidents of Council	22
Road Overseers	6
Recorders	6
Registrars of Deeds	4
Representatives (state)	13

SCHOOL OFFICIALS:

Presidents and School Boards	2
Members of School Boards	40
School Trustees	13
School Directors	70
School Comptrollers	2
Chairmen of Boards	2
School Supervisors	1
Members of Board of Education	12
School Clerks	7
School Treasurers	3

Surveyors	155
State Senators	2
Sheriffs	1

Supervisors (county, town and city)

Supervisors (of assessments)	40
Treasurers	1
Trustees (library)	29
Trustees (township, village, city)	2
	39

TOWN OFFICIALS:

Village Presidents	4
Members of Board of Selectmen	2
Members of Village Boards	4
Superintendents of Poor	3
Members of Board of Public Affairs	3
Chairmen of Town Boards	1
Chairmen of Board Trustees	1
Town Chairmen	1
Other Town Officials	9

Vice Mayors

Total	28
	1,039

THE SOCIALIST PRESS.

Since the national congress of 1910, two additional daily papers in the English language have been started, namely: The Milwaukee Leader, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and the Alarm, Belleville, Illinois. Weekly papers have sprung up in many places, over one hundred and fifty of them being co-operative papers. The mailing list at the National Office shows that the number of Socialist papers now published in this country is as follows:

Daily, English	5
Daily, foreign	8
Weekly, English	262
Weekly, foreign	36
Monthly, English	10
Monthly, foreign	2

PROPAGANDA PRESS SERVICE.

Each week the National Office sends out mimeographed articles to about four hundred Socialist, union and other papers. We offer to send them to any paper that will print at least one article per week. Comrades in various places have made such arrangements with their local non-Socialist papers, and we have placed them on the mailing list.

NEWS PRESS SERVICE.

During the sessions of Congress the National Office has sustained a press representative in Washington. He sends daily news service by mail to the Socialist dailies, and weekly service to the weekly Socialist and a number of union papers, and furnishes telegraphic service as desired. All of this service, except the telegraphic, is financed by the National Office and is supplied to the papers free of charge.

The National Office also sent a special press representative to Indianapolis for a short time. It rendered financial assistance to the representative of the Socialist press at Los Angeles. And it has arranged to cover the national convention for the Socialist press.

FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

There are now seven foreign speaking organizations affiliated with the party, as follows:

Bohemian, Finnish, Italian, Polish Alliance, Polish Section, Scandinavian and South Slavic.

All of these organizations are making substantial progress in carrying on Socialist propaganda among their own people.

An effort is now being made to unite the two Polish organizations.

Separate reports will be made by the Translator-Secretaries.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

Our relations with the international movement have been fraternal and mutually helpful.

In the eighth International Socialist Congress, held at Copenhagen, Denmark, from August 28 to September 4, 1910, our party was represented by eight delegates, namely: Victor L. Berger, Wm. D. Haywood, Robert Hunter, Morris Hillquit, Lena Morrow Lewis, John Spargo, May Wood-Simons and Luella Twining.

CONSTITUTIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

I request that the following recommendations be submitted to the Committee on Constitution:

We have come to the point where the itch for office is likely to cause an influx of old party politicians into our ranks. We should increase the length of membership necessary to be a candidate for public office. Doubtless an attempt will be made to let down the bars and make it easier to get into the party and easier to run for office. It should be made harder, not easier. This is too critical a juncture in our movement to throw down the safeguards and allow it to become the prey of designing self-seekers.

The signing of blank resignations by our candidates for public office should be made obligatory. Even though the capitalist courts might declare such resignations void, their moral effect is great. But no committee should be entrusted with the power to fill out and file such resignations. The membership in the territory covered by the office should alone have the power to decide when such action is to be taken.

The National Executive Committee and the Woman's National Committee should be elected from districts, so that the entire nation will be represented, such districts to be apportioned according to membership.

The provision for the Woman's Department in the National Office, which now stands merely as a provision adopted by the party congress, should be made a part of the constitution. The General Correspondent should be made electable by the Woman's National Committee, and dischargeable by it or by the National Secretary. At present she is appointed by the National Secretary, with the approval of the Woman's National Committee, and dischargeable by either.

To avoid a repetition of the fiasco which we have enacted this year in selecting the time and place for the national convention, it should be provided that the conventions and congresses are to be held in the city where the national headquarters are located, and that they are to be held in May or June. The National Executive Committee or the National Secretary should be given authority to fix the exact date, which would naturally be affected by the times when appropriate halls could be secured, and other circumstances. It is the natural thing for the other parties to jockey over the place of their conventions, but it is idiotic for us to do so.

The article about referendums needs to be overhauled. Branches should be given the power to initiate or second referendums. The time when a proposed referendum expires should be the 15th of the second month after its publication in the Monthly Bulletin.

At present the comments of locals or branches on proposed referendums are published in the Weekly Bulletin and also in the Monthly Bulletin.

As the Weekly Bulletin is a mimeographed document and must have some limit to it, this practice is becoming impracticable.

They should be published in the Monthly Bulletin only. These comments are on the increase. They show a healthy interest in party affairs and they need to be encouraged. But, unfortunately, a local dominated by a freak can take advantage of this right and degenerate it into a nuisance. To avoid this, and also to keep the comments within reasonable space limits, each local or branch making such comments should be required to pay the cost of publishing them. When a referendum is proposed, another referendum to the same effect should not be permitted within a given length of time. And when a referendum is adopted, a referendum to undo it should not be permitted within a given length of time. The referendum is our great safeguard, and it must not be allowed to be reduced to an absurdity. It should be made entirely serviceable and at the same time fool-proof.

Branches should also be given the power to nominate candidates for national party offices.

We ought to have some method of furnishing due stamps to distressed and unemployed members, without payment by them, and also without placing the burden on the branch, local or state organizations. If the National Office furnished such stamps, they would cost nothing except the trifling amount paid for printing them. They should be identical with all the other due stamps, so that there would be no taint of charity attached to them. The local secretaries should have the power to make requisition upon the state secretaries for whatever number of stamps are needed for this purpose, and the state secretaries should have the power to make requisition upon the National Secretary for them, without any money changing hands anywhere along the line.

Wherever practicable, candidates for public office should be nominated by referendum vote. It is entirely feasible to nominate our candidates for president and vice-president in that manner. Of course, it is too late to do it this time, but it should be done hereafter. It will not only be the proper method of nominating, but it will vastly increase the usefulness of our national conventions. They are now largely spoiled by the fact that they have such candidates to select. The provision should be so worded that in case of vacancy for president, the candidate for vice-president would take this place, and in case of vacancy for vice-president, the next highest would take his place.

State organizations should be required to furnish the National Office with a list of the local and branch secretaries in the state. Any state refusing or neglecting to do so thereby fails to co-operate with the rest of the organization, and it should be denied the right to participate in national affairs. It should be denied the right to vote on national referendums, or to initiate or second referendums, or to nominate candidates for national party positions. Its members of the National Committee should also be denied the right to vote on that committee. If it has any members of the National Executive Committee or the Woman's National Committee, they should be denied the right to act on those committees.

The provision requiring the National Office to take a referendum vote of a state in order to select state officers, upon presentation of a petition in case of controversy, should be struck out. It cost the National Office considerably more than a hundred dollars last year without accomplishing anything at all. It is unworkable,

unwise and unjust. Unworkable, because it is practically impossible to tell whether a petition is valid or not, or to tell who would be eligible to vote in the referendum. Unwise, because states can settle their own trouble much better than the National Office can settle it for them. Unjust, because it disfranchises a large portion of the members.

The condition in which the party congress of 1910 left the matter of the foreign speaking organizations is unsatisfactory to everybody. It is unsatisfactory to the national organization, to the state organizations, to the county and local organizations and to the foreign speaking organizations themselves. Part of these organizations get their dues stamps from the National Office and part of them get them from their locals. Part of them pay full local and state dues, part of them pay fifty per cent of the local and state dues, and part of them only pay national dues and do not pay any local and state dues at all. This unsystematic lack of arrangement is intolerable. The constitution should be so changed that all of them would be affiliated in the same manner. They should all pay fifty per cent of the local and state dues. And they should all pay their local, state and national dues to their respective national translator-secretaries, to be properly apportioned by them. The national dues should be paid in full as heretofore, because the National Office pays the wages of the translator-secretaries and furnishes them office room free of charge, besides appropriating large sums of money to assist them in organizing work. Not more than one organization of any single nationality should be permitted to affiliate.

Free-lancing should be abolished. When a comrade makes isolated dates with locals or branches it cannot properly be called free-lancing, and if done with the consent of the state organizations there can be no objection to it. In fact, it is a nuisance for the organization to handle such dates itself. But comrades should not be permitted to make up tours in any way except through the organization, and at the regular rates. The National Executive Committee has wisely stated that it is the sense of the committee that all lectures delivered by Socialist Party members for Socialist Party locals should be arranged by the organization of the party upon the usual terms, and that Socialist Party lecturers working for non-party lyceums be requested to make a stipulation with such lyceums that application for dates shall not be made to party locals or branches. This statement should be embodied in the constitution. And, lest it should be construed to only apply to capitalist lyceum bureaus, it should be definitely provided that Socialist papers and periodicals shall not engage in the practice of touring lecturers. It is outside their domain, and it interferes with the legitimate work of the organization.

The National Executive Committee and the National Committee should be prohibited from appropriating or loaning the party funds for purposes outside the activity of the national organization. Special calls for funds may well be made in special cases, but when money is voted out of the regular party funds, it keeps the National Office stripped of money and prevents it from developing its legitimate functions. Each appropriation or loan decreases the activity of the organization just that much.

There is no need of tying up several thousand dollars in a mileage fund by setting aside any percentage of the dues for that purpose. The necessary amount can

be accumulated immediately before a convention or congress by proper administration. That provision should be struck out of the constitution.

Since the membership has greatly increased, the apportionment of delegates to national congresses and conventions, delegates to international congresses, and national committeemen, should be changed accordingly.

It is a waste of money to publish in book form the speeches made at our national conventions and congresses. The proceedings, exclusive of speeches and mere parliamentary matter, should be published. This would prevent a waste of several hundred dollars.

There should be an information department in the National Office to act as a clearing house regarding the activities of our elected officials. They need to have the benefit of each other's experience, without each of them having to conduct a voluminous correspondence in order to secure it. The comrades in general also need this information. Such a department might also collect and furnish data on all manner of public and administrative questions.

Consideration should be given to the matter of creating departments in the National Office for the furtherance and development of the work of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society and of the Young People's Socialist League. These excellent activities ought to be carried on as integral parts of the organization.

The constitution should be so amended that the election of National Secretary will close at least one month before he takes his office. As it stands at present, his term begins only a day or two after the vote closes. This is unfortunate both for the elected and the defeated candidates, as they do not know what to count on nor whether they are at liberty to make other arrangements.

There should be a regular time set for the books of the National Office to be audited, and a method provided for selecting the auditors.

The bookkeeper and assistant bookkeeper in the National Office should be required to give bond, or else the provision requiring the National Secretary to give bond should be struck out. Just as the cashier of a bank has greater opportunity to get away with the funds than the president has, so also the bookkeeper and assistant bookkeeper have greater opportunity along that line than the National Secretary has. They make the entries in the books, handle the remittances and take them to the banks for deposit. I have the utmost confidence in them, but I am under bond myself, and the same caution which requires me to give bond should require it of them.

It is no longer necessary for us to prohibit the National Office from publishing an official organ or a periodical. It might become advantageous for us to do so. At any rate, the way should be opened by striking out those portions of the constitution. Our leaflets, our propaganda press service and our news press service show quite plainly that we have outgrown those provisions. Steps might well be taken to secure the second class mailing rate for the Monthly Bulletin so as to send it direct to each member who subscribes, and expand it into a monthly magazine.

The party press should be owned and controlled by the party organizations, local, state and perhaps national. As for the co-operative papers, there are now no less than eight companies publishing a total of over a hundred and fifty such papers,

at comparatively slight expense. Their value has been demonstrated by the election returns. These companies should be absorbed by the state or national organizations and the plan developed until there is a paper in every locality in the country. Or, in case it is not found feasible to absorb these companies, the organization should proceed to produce such papers anyhow. As to whether it should be done by the state or the national organization depends upon the wishes of the state organizations. If any considerable portion of them are unwilling to have the National Office handle the matter, it should be left to the states. This subject should receive the serious attention of the convention.

The National Executive Committee should be given authority to levy special assessments for the purpose of erecting buildings and purchasing printing machinery, also for the purpose of buying the necessary land for the buildings.

CAMPAIGN RECOMMENDATIONS.

I request that the following recommendations be submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means.

So far as the National Office is concerned, the campaign this year should be a literature campaign. It will be necessary, of course, for the National Office to tour the candidates for president and vice-president, and for the national translator-secretaries to tour speakers among the locals and branches in their own languages. But, in general, it is very unsystematic and uneconomical for the national and state organizations each to tour speakers over the same territory. Since the state organizations will be touring speakers anyhow, they should be allowed to tour all of them, with the above exceptions. This will avoid many conflicts and much bad blood. The National Office can of course use its good offices in assisting the state organizations and the speakers to get connected up together. Either this method should be adopted, or else the state organizations should practically abandon the touring of speakers during the campaign and turn the whole matter over bodily to the National Office, which they will hardly be willing to do.

If the National Office is permitted to confine itself largely to a literature campaign, it can flood the entire nation with literature. My idea is to secure the co-operation, so far as possible, of every local and branch in the United States in making systematic house-to-house distributions of leaflets once a week throughout the campaign; to get out a different leaflet each week for this purpose; to sell them to the locals and branches at cost; to furnish them free of charge to locals, branches and comrades who will undertake to distribute them in unorganized communities; to make use of the mailing list companies to send literature to vast numbers of non-Socialists; and to publish pamphlets at rock bottom prices. In this manner the National Office can carry on a stupendous literature campaign such as the Socialist Party has never undertaken or dreamed of undertaking in the past, provided we are permitted to concentrate upon it, and provided the National Office funds are not permitted to be voted away as appropriations.

It would be a mistake to have another Red Special. It was the right thing in 1908, but it would be a mistake to repeat it, for it would sap the finances and prevent the state and national organizations from carrying on the wide activities which will otherwise be possible. Immense meet-

ings can be arranged for the candidates in the regular manner, and they can be utilized for the purpose of putting vast quantities of literature into circulation.

The most direct method of raising a campaign fund is the best. I recommend that a special assessment of one dollar per member be levied; ten per cent of it to go to the National Office, forty per cent to the state office, and fifty per cent to the locals and branches.

The campaign ought not to be conducted on the vote catching plan. Without making any special appeal for votes, we will get all the votes that are coming to us and probably more. The campaign should be a campaign of education.

AN ERA OF BIG THINGS.

The Socialist Party is entering upon an era of big things. We must give ourselves room to do big things. We must expand our activities in accordance with the needs of the hour. We have a stupendous task before us and we must use the most efficient means of accomplishing it.

We have a stupendous task of education and a stupendous task of administration.

Anyone who permits himself to be fooled into believing that the path from here to the co-operative commonwealth is a smooth and gentle incline will find himself terribly mistaken.

On the contrary, there are mountains to climb, cliffs to scale, jungles to penetrate, rivers to ford and wild beasts to overcome, before the goal can be reached.

We shall have reverses and discouragements. We shall have need for every grain of our courage, wisdom, persistence, resourcefulness, constructiveness, and self-control.

But all obstacles will be overcome and the goal will be reached. The industries have evolved to the point where they are ripe for Socialism. It is ours to convince our fellow workmen and women that this is true, and to transform our principles into action. We believe that the present is the most promising moment in the world's history, and we face the future with enthusiastic confidence.

Fraternally submitted.

JOHN M. WORK,
National Secretary.

APPENDIX M

Report of Lyceum Department.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT, APRIL 15.

Receipts.	
Subscriptions:	
(Locals)	\$76,899.32
(Organizers) ..	379.00
(Misc.)	270.84
Slides (Lantern)	98.45
Printing	12.11
Special Lectures	1,561.31
Donations and Collections ..	499.31
Miscellaneous ..	222.68
	<hr/> \$79,943.02
Advanced by National Office before Jan. 1	3,038.75
	<hr/> \$82,981.77
Expenditures.	
Wages	\$ 6,510.02
Postage	1,859.79
Telephone and Telegraph ..	338.00
Freight and Express	1,971.54
Stationery and Supplies	536.35
Office Fixtures ..	849.19
Slides (Lantern Advertising) ..	124.28
Printing	12,250.06
Organizers	5,735.20
Lecturers	21,503.15
Subscriptions ..	27,166.58
Miscellaneous ..	298.69
	<hr/> \$79,142.85
Bank Balance, April 15 ...	3,838.92
	<hr/> \$82,981.77
Assets on Hand.	
Bank Balance, April 15	\$ 3,838.92
Office Fixtures (approx.) ...	700.00
Supplies	500.00
	<hr/> \$ 5,038.92
Liabilities.	
Freight and Express	\$ 53.51
Stationery and Supplies	45.20
Printing60
National Office ..	3,086.71
	<hr/> \$ 3,186.12
Estimate of Unfinished Business.	
Amount still due from Locals.	\$21,962.28
Amount needed to complete course:	
Office (estimated) ...	\$ 400.00
Lecturers (estimated) ..	1,600.00
Subscriptions (estimated) ..	10,000.00
	<hr/> \$12,000.00

I shall submit at the convention for the consideration of such delegates as may be interested a detailed and itemized statement of the amount paid by each Local and the amount paid to each organizer, lecturer and publisher, together with the number of subscriptions forwarded to each up to May 9th.

It is probable that this entire work will be completed without one cent of expense to the National treasury. In the amount put down as due the National Office is included one-fifth of the National Secretary's salary and part of the salary of other National Office employees proportionate to the increase that the Lyceum has meant in their work. The Lyceum has also been charged with one-half the National Office telephone, one-third the light and one-fourth of the rent, so that it can truly be said to have been self-sustaining. In comparing it with any other Party activities, this should be kept in mind.

That, whereas practically all other propaganda work is partly paid for with dues, either local, state or national, not a cent of dues-money has been used to carry on the Lyceum, except that about \$3,000 was advanced during six months preceding January 1, to start it. This is now on hand and can be returned at any time. The entire proposition has been paid for out of the commissions on the Socialist papers, and books sold by the comrades.

EVOLUTION OF LYCEUM PLAN.

But the real significance of this Lyceum work cannot be measured in terms of money. Weighing the arguments for and against it, it is essential to understand the conditions that led up to the project, the fundamental ideas at the bottom of it and the objects to be accomplished.

Like many other comrades, I have for years studied the problem of how to hold our Party membership. I noted that during campaign time our membership always grows, but when no active campaign is being waged by a local, the tendency is ever present for the organization to dissolve itself into a mere little philosophical discussion society, where a few of the faithful come together semi-occasionally and engage in the more or less pleasant pastime of "clarifying" each other.

With others, I have come to the conclusion that just as a man must exercise to develop his muscle, so an organization to hold its members and build itself up, MUST WORK.

The first purpose of the National Socialist Lyceum is to furnish this work to locals, together with a special incentive for them to do it; work that is worth while enough to bring back into the harness every old war horse and to make use of the enthusiastic energy of every new convert; work through which they will learn that they can accomplish more together as an organization than by themselves as individual bushwhackers;

ERROR: stackunderflow
OFFENDING COMMAND: ~

STACK: